

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 1883.

The Week.

IF President Arthur intends to carry on his Administration upon civil-service reform principles, not only as to the clerks in the departments, but also as to Presidential appointments, he would do well to look after the doings of Mr. Hatton, the Assistant Postmaster-General, who manages the larger part of the Post-office "patronage." The people of Camden, Maine, are holding indignation meetings to protest against the appointment as Postmaster of Mr. W. B. Rich in the place of "the present incumbent, Alden Miller, a wounded soldier, who did not pay his party assessment." And a strong protest is going to the Senate against the confirmation of Mr. W. H. Tubbs, nominated for reappointment as Postmaster at New London, Connecticut, it being alleged that Mr. Tubbs had been guilty of some exceedingly questionable proceedings as Assistant Postmaster under his predecessor, for which he is now under criminal prosecution. The recent exposure of Mr. Hatton's methods of making postmasters all over the country serve the interests of the Stalwart organ in Washington, the *National Republican*, of which he is part owner, seems to justify the inference that under Mr. Hatton's administration appointments and reappointments of postmasters will depend not only on a satisfactory answer to the question whether the candidate will be an active party worker and pay his assessments, but also whether he will be an efficient agent for Mr. Hatton's newspaper.

The St. Louis *Republican* publishes an extract from a letter addressed by General Sherman to a friend in that city, in which the General declares that "no earthly consideration will induce him to embitter the remainder of his life by holding out the least prospect that any possible combination of circumstances or events will make him a Presidential candidate." The General then goes on to say:

"There are plenty of good men able and willing to undertake the office—abler than I profess to be, and with as much patriotism. The President at best is but a figurehead. Congress is the real power in this Government, and any President who undertakes to stamp his individuality will find himself tied hand and foot by laws. I ask you to assert with emphasis that you know my unalterable determination, and that it will be idle to appeal to me. The country is perfectly safe, and no amount of party clamor can seriously disturb its harmony or prosperity." This is eminently sensible talk. General Sherman has won a military reputation and a popularity which an attempt at playing a political rôle would be more apt to endanger than to increase. No candidate for the Presidency can in these days run on the mere strength of his military renown. General Sherman probably underestimates the power of the Presidential office; but he is right when he apprehends that a mind as active as his is would, on the political field, be constantly in danger of getting into trouble.

The new Governor of Michigan, Mr. Begole, opens his inaugural message with a sugges-

tion that the term "governor" is "a harsh and inappropriate" designation for the office which he occupies. He says his position is really that of a "principal servant," and his feeling is that a servant of the people ought not to be called their "governor." But there are objections also to the use of Servant. Long use has accustomed us to talk about public servants and the public service; but, apart from association, there seems to be something repulsive and odious in the idea of a free American citizen being called a Servant. Does it not suggest menial, or what the Penal Code calls "servile," labor rather than public employment? To be sure we call the elective body a "sovereign," but the servants of a sovereign suggest a class known in literature and politics as "pampered menials," and are not both terms inherited from monarchical times? The word "help," introduced to meet the difficulties suggested by the word "servant" in private life in the earlier and purer days of the Republic, seems to cover the ground exactly, and we do not see why it should not be extended to public employment wherever the sensitiveness of the community demands it. "Principal Help" would wound no one's feelings as the name of the Governor, while "Second Help" would be a good substitute for Lieutenant-Governor.

The bill restoring Fitz-John Porter to the rank he held in the regular Army before his dismissal twenty years ago, but without pay or compensation, has passed the Senate. It is to be hoped it will pass the House, but this is not so certain. Nothing really stands in its way but prejudice, which probably no argument or discussion would overcome. The case is one of the most remarkable on record, in that its history records the conversion of nearly every competent authority who has examined it from a strong conviction of guilt to a strong conviction of innocence. There is hardly anybody now of note who adheres to the decision of the first court-martial except General Logan, and his opinions on it are clearly mingled with, and can hardly be separated from, the recollections and traditions of the period of Porter's condemnation, when his treachery was one of the dogmas of all patriotic people. It is based, too, on an assumption of which the history of every war furnishes a score of refutations, that dissatisfaction with or contempt for a general makes a subordinate officer ready to betray the army and the cause. The fierce grumbler is one of the best known of military characters, but in most cases he is among the hardest fighters.

An interesting analysis by *Bradstreet's* shows that of the 2,328 failures reported during the last quarter of last year, 2,004, or nearly 86 per cent., were of traders ranging in commercial importance from "no financial standing worth taking into account" to a capital of \$5,000. The capital of the remaining 324, or about 14 per cent., ranged from the last-mentioned amount to \$350,000, only eleven having more than \$100,000. Returns for the second week of this year show an increase of 139 in the

number of failures as compared with the corresponding week of last year. In 1883, of 342 traders 307 had a capital of \$5,000 or less. In 1882, of 203 traders 181 had a capital of \$5,000 or less. The conclusion is that although there are more failures, the proportion of small cases is such as to prevent any widespread anxiety.

We are not sure to what homicide the pathetic article in the *Lynchburg Virginian* on which we comment elsewhere referred, but we believe it was a social homicide of an awful kind which occurred at a ball in Bedford County, Va., on January 8. A gentleman named Clayton was calling out the figures, and one of the ladies, a "debutante," Miss Idelle Read, corrected him in a way that irritated him a little, and he answered in a tone which offended one of her admirers, Mr. Armstead Barksdale, who thereupon remonstrated with Mr. Clayton. "Hot words passed, and finally Barksdale drew a knife, and, springing on Clayton, inflicted a horrible gash from the right eye to the back of the neck, severing the jugular vein, and causing death almost instantly. The scene that followed was sickening. The ball-room floor was a puddle of blood, and the gay white dresses of the girls were bedraggled with blood." Some of them fainted, and then there followed a "mêlée" among the men, in which, however, no one else was hurt. Here we have again the big butcher knife concealed about the person even at a ball-room, the fierce temper, so unused to control that a few "hot words," even in the presence of women, lead to instant and brutal murder, the closing mêlée during which the murderer escapes—all, we are sorry to say, frequent incidents of the social homicide. This one had a happier termination than most of them, for the murderer showed sufficient sense of decency to shoot himself on the following day.

There was a typical business homicide at Monroe, La., two days ago. "L. D. McClain and Mr. V. C. McCollough, both prominent citizens, became involved in a difficulty over a business transaction, which resulted in the death of the latter gentleman." McClain owed McCollough some money. They met in the street, and McCollough asked for the money, which McClain promised to pay the next day, and they separated. But McClain stopped, and turned, and there were "hot words," and the debtor drew a pistol, and there was a scuffle, and he shot his creditor "just above the right eye," killing him on the spot. We can easily imagine the gloom which this affair will produce in Monroe, and how deeply it will be deplored by the whole State of Louisiana; but this will do poor McCollough very little good, and it must be admitted that it will have a chilling effect on people who propose to lend money in that State.

Ex Senator Dorsey's letter announcing his resignation of the Secretaryship of the Republican National Committee is one of his most

characteristic performances. He tells the world once more what a great man he is, and what extraordinary things he has done as a political manager, and how he enjoyed the confidence of General Garfield and General Arthur. And then he informs the National Committee that the only reason why he can no longer be their Secretary is that his eyes are bad. And he explains his absence from the last two meetings of the Committee by the fact that he had "engagements elsewhere." What these "engagements elsewhere" really were he does not say. Neither does he dwell upon the possible engagements elsewhere which might in the future prevent him from attending the meetings of the Republican National Committee, unless those meetings be held, for his personal accommodation, in jail. If a hundred years hence some antiquarian should find among old records this letter of Mr. Dorsey's, and nothing else about him, he would be apt to say, "What a pity such a great and useful man had bad eyes and engagements elsewhere!" But if he should at the same time discover a record of the Star-route swindles, he would say, "How could a great party permit such a man to occupy a position among its leaders, and what an impudent impostor he was to strike such grand attitudes before the American people while on trial under an indictment for conspiring to rob the public treasury."

A curious despatch from Washington was published yesterday. It reported a rumor that Senator Cameron, of Pennsylvania, "will not, under any circumstances, be a candidate for reelection in 1884." And to clinch the matter, it was further reported that Colonel Quay, one of Boss Cameron's principal henchmen, was, with others, "in deliberation all yesterday afternoon to determine the selection of his successor." Why Mr. Cameron's henchmen should at this early day be "in deliberation" all of an afternoon to "determine" two years ahead who is to be Mr. Cameron's successor, is mysterious. No wonder the report goes on to say that "their session was very stormy." But, notwithstanding "Senator Cameron's declination, as delivered to Quay, is said to be positive and imperative," the opponents of boss-rule in Pennsylvania had better be careful to secure to themselves, or rather to the Republican party at large, the power to "determine the selection of Mr. Cameron's successor," and, above all things, not to permit Mr. Cameron to be tempted to change that resolution which at present is said to be so "positive and imperative." Mr. Cameron might yield to the seduction of opportunity at the last moment, and accept the Senatorship once more for himself. Camerons are weak in that respect.

We are sorry to see a disposition in some of our contemporaries to ridicule the efforts of Jay Gould to do good. Mayor Stowell, of Milwaukee, in acknowledging Gould's subscription of \$500 to the fire-relief fund, takes a different view of the subject. He says: "It is timely, and should rank you with the noble philanthropists who distinguish this

age above all previous eras in the world's history." It seems to be thought in some quarters that Gould cannot be "a noble philanthropist" because he is a somewhat worldly and hardened "financier." But this does not prevent him from being a noble philanthropist, but, on the contrary, furnishes him with the required capital to set up as one. His time has been fully occupied hitherto in accumulating this, and in his case the task has been more than usually difficult and absorbing on account of the great risks which the peculiar nature of his financial operations involves. He has far less weight of that sort on his mind now than in the old Fisk days, however, and we are not surprised to see him begin to do good. In his old age we see no reason why he should not become an expert philanthropist. He may of course make blunders like other men. His stopping the night trains on the elevated roads, in order to discourage late hours, and thus elevate the morals of the public, is just one of those little mistakes which the well-meaning but inexperienced philanthropist would be likely to make; but he will no doubt improve continually as he becomes more and more accustomed to doing good.

The facts in the Miller extradition case, which is now under consideration by the State Department, are said to be these: Miller, in 1881, broke into a farm-house in Allegheny County, Pa., attacked the inmates, and carried off a quantity of Government bonds and other property. He was tried for the burglary, and sentenced to eight years in the Western Penitentiary. After serving nearly two years of his term he escaped, and was traced to Toronto. Under our extradition treaty with England burglary is not an extraditable crime, but assault with intent to murder is; so, in order to get him back, an application was made for his surrender, on the ground of the assault committed in the course of the burglary. The extradition papers were regularly issued, and Miller was brought back, but immediately on his return he was clapped into prison to serve out the remainder of his term for burglary, and he has never been tried at all for the crime for which he was extradited. The matter has been brought up in the Canadian Parliament, and resolutions passed demanding an explanation. The case again calls attention to the very unsatisfactory condition of our relations with England relative to extradition. In the Winslow case the question of the right to extradite a man for one crime and try him for another was raised, and the difficulty is still undisposed of, though some of the courts have cut the diplomatic knot by holding, as Judge Hoffman in California did the other day, that the criminal can set up a want of jurisdiction to try him in such a case. But whether Miller could resort to *habeas corpus* and liberate himself, seems very doubtful, because he is lawfully detained under his original sentence, however irregular his recapture may have been. On the other hand, it is perfectly clear that such proceedings as those said to have been taken in the Miller case are

not contemplated by our extradition treaty with England. It is evident that we need a new extradition treaty between the two countries which shall regulate the international criminal code more minutely than the present instrument does. The intricacy of extradition questions as they exist is of no advantage to anybody in either country but criminals.

There appears to be a strong desire among English Liberals to regard the Irish question as settled, and the House of Commons as released from the necessity of devoting any more attention to Irish affairs. Mr. Forster gave emphatic utterance to the thought of which this wish is the father in a recent speech in Scotland, and the London press, except the *Daily News* and the *Pall Mall Gazette*, eagerly echoes it, and many of the moderate Liberal orators are joining in the chorus. The Irish have once more—for about the twentieth time—received all they are entitled to, and, what is more, all they are ever going to get, and if they are not quiet now, they ought to be thoroughly and perennially "repressed." Mr. Chamberlain, however, by no means shares these comfortable views, and we believe Mr. Gladstone does not do so either. The former pointed out at Birmingham that though much had been done for Ireland, a great deal remained to be done in the line of putting the country on a footing of equality with England as regarded the suffrage and the government of municipalities, and he warned his hearers that the Irish question would never be settled or out of the way until a sense of political responsibility had been implanted in Irishmen by prolonged practice in the management of their own affairs. Irish members of Parliament, in other words, must in some way be turned into legislators, and Irish voters, in voting for members of Parliament, must learn to feel that they are voting for legislators, and not simply for clever brawlers and revilers. Until these things have been brought about, all hopes of relief from the Irish question on the part of the English public are chimerical.

We believe it is no secret that Mr. Gladstone takes this view very strongly—that he holds that the growth of Irish national feeling during the past twenty-five or thirty years has been so great that no permanent pacification of Ireland can be looked for until it is in some manner satisfied. If he were to remain in office, he would doubtless set himself to satisfy it, for no such idea as this has ever lain long unfruitful in his mind. But it is becoming pretty clear that the great days of his legislative activity are over. He is not a man of the Palmerston type, who can make the cares of office bearable even in extreme old age by taking a semi-jocose view of all human affairs, nor yet a man of the Melbourne type, who thinks the best thing to do with a troublesome question is to let it alone. If he were to remain in office, he would, under what seems to be a law of his nature, have to embody his ideas in bills and try to get them passed, and to the endless toil and endeavor which this now entails he is probably no longer equal. We may, therefore, expect to see him retire after the coming session,

even if the doctors do not insist on it sooner. When this happens, there will probably be a sharp collision on the Irish question—which is sure to be burning, no matter who is in office—between the Radical wing of the party, as represented by Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke, and the Conservative wing, represented by Lord Derby and Sir William Harcourt. Both of the latter are, in the Irish matter, in favor of the old English remedy of "repression," as it is called there, or "troops," as it used to be called here, and they probably represent the prevailing sentiment among the class, whether Liberal or Tory, which hates Gladstone, and, on the Irish question and all other questions, takes its stand with the rights of property. No power short of Mr. Gladstone could keep two sets of men so discordant in opinion in the same Cabinet. When once his influence is removed they must separate.

The protestations of innocence made on the scaffold by some of the men recently convicted of murder in Ireland on evidence which no reasonable man could for a moment gain-say, have excited a good deal of attention in England, as some of the Irish agitators have treated them as proof of innocence. The controversy has caused the disinterment of a little religious manual, entitled 'What Every Christian Must Know and Do,' widely sold in Ireland at the price of one cent, and bearing the late Cardinal Cullen's confirmation, which is believed by some to throw some light on the matter. Whether it does or no, it offers Catholic theologians an opportunity of making an explanation of some kind. It says that when absolution is given by the priest, "your sins are forgiven, the pains of hell taken away, and your soul made bright and beautiful like an angel of God, and the kingdom of Heaven is yours." This, of course, suggests the theory that the murderer on the scaffold may, in good faith, after absolution, declare himself "innocent as the child unborn." The definition of murder in the Manual points in the same direction. It describes murder as "unjustly taking away another's life"—not, be it observed, unlawfully—and a foot-note on this adds: "It is not a sin to desire some temporal misfortune to another to make him cease to give scandal, or be converted, or not persecute the good." It is easy to see how readily in the mind of an excited peasant this definition and elucidation might be made to cover obnoxious landlords, agents, bailiffs, and even policemen and judges.

The Egyptian crisis has advanced one step nearer a solution, by Lord Dufferin's formal withdrawal from the Financial Control on behalf of England. This is, in other words, the restoration to the Egyptians of complete administration of their finances, which was surrendered to France and England by the late Khedive, and which was one of the causes of complaint on which Arabi most relied when getting up the late war. France has held on to the Control all along, and would probably hold on to it now if the Khedive did not abolish it, which he probably will in a few days. In lieu of the Control, Lord Dufferin recommends the appointment of some kind of European financial adviser. Such an officer before Tel-el-Kebir would probably

have been of but little value, because he would not have been listened to. Now, he will probably do nearly as well as the Control.

The difficulties of the French in dealing with the various phases of British management in Egypt are very curious, and are described with great naïveté in the newspapers. The normal temper of the press toward England is rather angry, but the objurgations it bestows on her never end in any practical suggestion. It objected strongly to the invasion, but produced no plan of preventing it. It objected to the occupation after the war, also, but was unable to say how it could be helped. It has, too, protested loudly against England's undertaking the reorganization of Egypt alone, but has no way of dealing with the determination of the other Powers not to interfere with her. It now protests against the abolition of the Control, and warns the British that they will have to be very careful what they offer in its place, but it does not indicate what will happen if the British pay no attention, and are not careful.

The arrest of that thoroughly absurd person Prince Napoleon (Jerome), as he used to call himself, for placarding the walls of Paris with an announcement that the Republic was a failure, and that the remedy was Bonapartism, is the latest French sensation. Some foreign critics are disposed to regard the arrest as a mistake, and hold that the Prince's manifesto should have been treated with silent contempt, but the Chamber evidently thinks otherwise, and sustains the action of the Ministry by a large majority. He is not a great or important personage, but he is the heir of what was twelve years ago an apparently great dynasty, and, although he has been repudiated by its present adherents, he is the father of Prince Victor, whom they all treat as its present chief, and the rightful claimant of the throne. It would hardly do to pretend wholly to ignore the acts of such a man at such a time. On the other hand, it will hardly do to make too much of him. It will probably be wise to prosecute him like any other man for the violation of a police regulation, but it would be a great mistake to send him into exile as a dangerous person, and have his son grow up abroad as another Young Pretender. He would be treated with half-royal consideration by foreign courts, and form a little court of his own with sham state and dignity, surrounded with malcontents, who would send glowing accounts to the Bonapartist papers in France of the virtues and graces of their young master, and keep up a propaganda which would be impossible if their chief were an idle young gentleman of leisure living in Paris, and no more remarked or remarkable than scores of others of his kind to be found at the clubs. In fact, a French Pretender is now nowhere so harmless as in France, for in his case, more than in most, 'tis distance lends enchantment to the view.

As to Prince Napoleon, no one but himself pretends that he has any importance. He has failed in every position in which he has been placed, both civil and military, is old, and afflicted with a disease which, if not certainly

mortal, unfits for care or responsibility. Of Prince Victor, the son, little or nothing is known. He is not long out of college, and has thus far nothing in his favor but the will of the Prince Imperial, who bequeathed the Empire to him, the favor of the ex-Empress, and the support of Paul de Cassagnac, the brawling editor of the *Paix*. These aids could, however, hardly count for much, unless the French people swallowed that curious theory of the Bonapartists, that although there is no such thing as hereditary right to rule, and all power should be based on a plebiscite, yet every properly conducted plebiscite is sure to find the right man to rule in the eldest male of the house of Bonaparte, or in the male designated for the succession by the last reigning member of the house or his acknowledged heir. A more curious mixture of the divine right of kings and of popular sovereignty was probably never concocted, but there is no proof that it ever at any time took hold of the French imagination. There has never been a freely elected Bonaparte, because every Bonaparte, when offering himself for election, has always stood ready with the army to see that the Noes got nothing even if they were in a majority. It is said that the Comte de Chambord is also preparing a manifesto to the French people. If so, it shows the wisdom of the majority of the French Senate in refusing to issue an address to the people on the occasion of Gambetta's death. It is now the game of the Monarchists to emphasize as much as possible his importance to the Republic, and to exaggerate the greatness of his loss; any Republican manifestations on the same subject which went beyond funeral honors, would help them in spreading the notion that his disappearance from the scene prepared the way for another revolution. M. Floquet's panicky motion in the Chamber of Deputies, calling for the expulsion from France and Algiers of members of former French dynasties, is open to much the same objection. It countenances the belief that the country is passing through some kind of a crisis, which makes dangerous the presence on French soil of half-a-dozen private gentlemen who have lived there peaceably for the last twelve years.

One good result, and perhaps the only one, of Gambetta's failure when he took office last year, was the demonstration which it afforded that he was not a necessary man—that France could get along when even he could not form a stable Ministry. Thiers's retirement did a world of good in the same direction. Anything which fosters the belief in the French mind that any one person is a serious loss, prevents the growth of the political self-reliance from want of which France has suffered so much. This is so true that it makes anything beyond funeral honors to a great politician almost mischievous. There is a constant tendency in French opinion toward the creation of necessary men or society savers, which it is the first duty of French statesmen to resist, as the great impediment to the firm establishment of free government, and it sometimes, as in the present case, may have to be resisted at the cost of seeming to fail in respect for a great memory.

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

[WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1883, TO TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 1883, INCLUSIVE.]

DOMESTIC.

At the Cabinet meeting on Tuesday, the Civil-Service Bill was the principal topic of discussion. The point was made that the section of the bill authorizing the Commission to employ a chief examiner was unconstitutional, as the appointment should have been vested in the President or the head of one of the departments. It was finally concluded that the difficulty might be averted by the President appointing the examiner upon the recommendation of the Commissioners. The bill was then signed by the President.

On Wednesday the Senate took up the Tariff Bill, and Senator Morrill made a speech in support of it. On Thursday the Fitz-John Porter Bill was passed by a vote of 33 to 27. Senators Cameron, Hoar, and Sewell voting with the Democrats for the bill. This bill sets aside the finding of the court-martial in 1863, which deprived General Porter of his rank in the Army and his citizenship. An amendment, providing that restoration to the Army should not entitle General Porter to pay for the time he has been deprived of his rank, was adopted. On Friday Mr. Ingalls introduced a Presidential disability bill, which was referred to the Judiciary Committee, and the Senate went into executive session. On Saturday the Agricultural Bill was discussed. On Monday the Tariff Bill was again discussed.

The House on Friday passed the Shipping Bill by a vote of 159 to 54, but the drawback, free-ship, and free-materials provisions adopted in Committee of the Whole had been stricken out. The bill provides that vessels duly registered, except coasting vessels, shall be deemed vessels of the United States, so long as they shall be wholly owned and commanded by citizens of the United States, and that all foreign articles and materials for the repair of vessels engaged in the foreign trade are to be admitted free of duty. The bill, as passed by the House, will not materially affect the ship-building interests of the country one way or the other. On Saturday the Fortifications Bill was passed. It appropriates \$175,000 for the repair, and \$100,000 for the armament of fortifications, and \$50,000 for torpedoes for harbor defences. Total, \$325,000. A bill was passed fixing the pension of a person who has lost an eye in the military or naval service. The House on Tuesday passed the bill amending the act regulating the removal of causes from State to Federal courts.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs on Friday authorized a resolution to be introduced asking the President to make a more liberal treaty with the German Empire. Under the present treaty certain American citizens have been wrongfully forced to bear arms, while in other cases individuals have evaded the duties of German citizens by carrying papers of American citizenship when they had no right to them.

President Arthur gave the first state dinner of the season at Washington on Friday, in honor of General and Mrs. Grant.

The President has withdrawn the nomination of John F. Olmstead for District Commissioner of the District of Columbia, as it had become evident that the nomination would not be confirmed.

Ex-Senator Dorsey sent a letter to Mr. Jewell, Chairman of the National Republican Committee, on Tuesday, offering his resignation of the Secretaryship of the National Republican Committee, and giving a very pleasing account of his past party services.

The Prime Minister of British Columbia having requested Captain Stodder, of the United States revenue steamer *Oliver Wolcott*, to lend his assistance in suppressing Indian troubles at Fort Simpson, because no British

war vessel is now in those waters, Secretary Folger has directed Captain Stodder to be present with his ship and prevent violence, but not to use force unless in repelling attacks on whites, and then only on a written request from the British Columbia authorities.

The thirty-first annual meeting of the United States Agricultural Society was held on Wednesday at the Department of Agriculture. The President, the Hon. John A. King, of New York, delivered his annual address, in which he gave a sketch of the operations of the Society until they were stopped by the war, and showed the necessity for beginning work again as a central Board of Agriculture, chartered by act of Congress, and having on its roll of membership many leading citizens. The officers of the past year were reelected.

The trouble about the payment of the physicians who attended President Garfield has apparently been settled, as all of them have accepted their warrants and drawn the money upon them.

An attempt was made in the Ohio Legislature to pass a joint resolution endorsing the action of Congress in passing the Civil-Service Bill on Thursday, but it was referred to the Committee on Federal Relations. In the State House of Representatives a resolution thanking Mr. Pendleton, and congratulating him on the passage of the bill, was passed, but the Democrats opposed it and refused to vote.

Senator Salisbury was reelected United States Senator from Delaware on Tuesday, receiving 8 votes in the Senate and 18 in the House. Senator Ransom was reelected in North Carolina by a total vote of 108 against 47 for Johnson. Senator Harris was reelected in Tennessee. Senator Garland was reelected in Arkansas by an almost unanimous vote.

The Republican joint caucus of the Illinois Legislature on Thursday nominated Governor Cullom for United States Senator. The House on the same day adopted a resolution declaring any officer of the State ineligible for United States Senator, if elected while in office. This was intended to bar Governor Cullom, but as he received in the caucus three more votes than a majority of the whole Legislature, his election is regarded as assured.

At a meeting of the Democratic State Committee of Maine on Thursday, it was voted hereafter to make straight party nominations for all State officers, thus abandoning fusion.

Governor Stoneman, of California, was inaugurated Wednesday. In his inaugural address he took strong grounds in favor of compelling corporations to bear their share of taxation and submit to regulation of fares and freights; deprecated the consulting of partisan purposes in the reapportionment of the State, and demanded an economical and faithful administration of public affairs.

The Grand Jury of Davidson County, Tenn., on Saturday, presented an indictment against the defaulting Treasurer Polk for embezzlement and larceny of \$480,000. It is stated that the Judge of the Criminal Court will fix a charge of conspiracy upon certain persons for obtaining funds from Polk knowing them to be funds of the State. Polk arrived in Nashville on Saturday in charge of officers.

A statement prepared by the Commissioner of Agriculture of South Carolina shows that there are twenty-seven cotton-mills in operation or nearing completion in that State, with an aggregate capital of \$4,547,000. They give employment to 4,262 hands, and pay out annually in wages \$728,900. In 1880 there were eighteen mills in the State, with a total capital of \$2,294,600.

The Newhall House, at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, was totally destroyed by fire early Wednesday morning. The hotel was full of guests, badly built, very combustible, and unprovided with means of escape, the consequence being that over one hundred persons lost their lives, but the exact number has not

yet been ascertained. It was one of the most shocking disasters of the kind that have occurred for many years.

The Planters' House, St. Louis, was slightly injured by fire early Sunday morning. All the guests were saved, but three employees were killed.

The prevalence of smallpox in Baltimore has caused the Health Department of Washington to adopt extraordinary measures to prevent the infection from spreading there. The Health Officer sent one of his subordinates to Baltimore to investigate the matter, and he reported that there were about 2,000 cases in that city, only 800 of which were reported by the Baltimore Health Department.

Lot M. Morrill died at Augusta, Me., on Wednesday. He was born in 1818, and became Governor of Maine, United States Senator, and Secretary of the Treasury by appointment of President Grant, to succeed Mr. Bristow. At the time of his death he was Collector of the Port of Portland.

The annual report of the President of Harvard College for the academic year 1881-2 was submitted on Wednesday. The number of special students in the University continues to increase, and the Faculty has finally admitted them to all the privileges of undergraduates, except that of obtaining a degree. The President says that the increased attention given to physical exercise and athletic sports during the past twenty-five years has been, on the whole, of great advantage to the University, and that the average physique of the students has been much improved; and he gives statistics showing that the majority of students prominent in athletic sports not only have not neglected their college work, but rank high in their classes. The library is greatly in need of funds to be applied to administration and service. The new laboratory, which is to cost \$115,000, will be started in the spring. The measures taken to prevent the continuance of the annual deficit have been successful, and for the coming year there will probably be a small surplus. Since 1869 \$2,300,000 has been spent for land and buildings. The attention of friends and supporters of the University should now be turned to the increase of the quick capital, or invested funds, and especially of unrestricted funds and funds devoted to comprehensive purposes. The attempt to teach the Chinese language has been a failure.

FOREIGN

A manifesto issued by Prince Napoleon was published in the *Figaro* and placarded on the walls in Paris on Tuesday. It dwelt on the incapacity and impotence of the Government, the division of Parliament, and the decadence of the Army and finances; and declared that religion was attacked, and that the observance of the Concordat could alone establish religious peace. The manifesto was torn down from the walls, the *Figaro* was seized, and Prince Napoleon was arrested. In the country at large the affair seems to have excited little interest.

The remains of Gambetta were interred at Nice on Saturday. Only three speeches were delivered, Gambetta's family having objected to any more. All the shops remained open. Gambetta's father informed the delegation from Paris which endeavored to induce him to alter his decision in regard to the disposition of his son's remains, that after his death Paris might take them.

The French Senate has elected Senator Le-Royer President of this body. The Chamber of Deputies elected M. Spuller, member from the Department of the Seine, Vice-President. M. Challemeil-Lacour made a proposal that the Republican Senators should issue an address to the country on Gambetta's death, but on the submission of the proposal to the several sections of the Republican Senators, the Left Centre and the Left objected to it. A meeting was held at which it was resolved that such an address would add nothing to the

grandeur of Gambetta's funeral. One objection urged was that such an address would appear like an admission that the Republic was in jeopardy. The decision not to issue the address is regarded as a rebuff to the Gambettist Senators. The members of the Extreme Left in the Chamber of Deputies have decided to demand of the Government an inquiry as to the origin and progress of the anarchical movement in France.

At the trial of the Anarchists at Lyons on Monday, Prince Krapotkine, in addressing the court in his own defence, sought to show that the so-called Internationale did not exist. Anarchical ideas, he declared, were spreading, despite all efforts to suppress them. He said if he were condemned the result would be to attract proselytes to the cause. He had been arrested, he averred, because he was a foreigner, and because it was thought desirable to gibbet an effigy of the Internationale. The eyes of all workmen in France and abroad were fixed upon this trial, he said; but when they found that the Internationale did not exist, they would recognize it as merely a prosecution of one class by another. Prince Krapotkine concluded by predicting that ten years would not elapse without the occurrence of a social revolution. He conjured society to avert it by studying the social question instead of prosecuting anarchy.

In the French Chamber of Deputies, on Monday, M. Duclerc, Minister of Foreign Affairs, said that during the Egyptian hostilities the attitude of France was to England that of a confiding friend separated by temporary divergences. After the suppression of the rebellion, France favored the reestablishment of the *status quo*. Pending overtures from England, the latter having wished alone to assume the task of regulating the situation, France resumed her liberty of action, the Government being certain that this course would meet the approbation of the Chamber.

Lord Dufferin has informed the Egyptian Ministry that Great Britain withdraws from the Control, and suggests the appointment of a European financial adviser who will not interfere with the public administration. It is expected that the Khedive will, in a few days, issue a decree abolishing the Control on account of this withdrawal.

Sir Auckland Colvin, the English Controller-General in Egypt, and the Private Secretary to the Control have tendered their resignations to the Khedive, who has accepted them.

The British Government has issued a note in regard to Egypt, which proposes that, in order to avoid any abuse of the freedom of the Suez Canal, it shall be enacted that in time of war a limitation shall be placed on the time during which the vessels of a belligerent power are permitted to remain in the canal, and that no troops or munitions of war shall be disembarked, and no hostilities shall be permitted in the canal or its approaches, or anywhere in the territorial waters of Egypt, even in the event of Turkey being one of the belligerents. The recurrence of an emergency resembling the late rebellion is provided for by a clause excepting measures for the defence of Egypt from the above restrictions. Egypt shall take all measures in her power to enforce the conditions imposed upon ships of belligerent powers using the canal. No fortifications are to be erected on the canal or in its vicinity. Nothing in the agreement shall be construed as curtailing the territorial rights of Egypt further than is expressly stipulated. Among other subjects the note declares the question of the suppression of slavery and the slave trade to be one which the British Government has much at heart, and that it will miss no opportunity of advising the Khedive to take steps calculated to attain the end in view.

The Prince of Wales on Saturday unveiled at the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich the statue which was erected to the memory of the French Prince Imperial by the sub-

scriptions of 25,000 officers and men of the British Army, at a cost of £4,310. The Prince of Wales was accompanied by his two sons and by the Dukes of Edinburgh and Cambridge. The Queen sent two wreaths. Gen. Lord Wolseley, Prince Lucien Bonaparte, the Duc de Bassano, and a large and distinguished company assisted at the unveiling of the monument. In the course of his remarks the Prince of Wales said it was obvious that the ceremony was not a political one, in any sense of the word. "We are simply unveiling a monument to the memory of a young and gallant prince who fell fighting for the Queen of England."

A Parliamentary return reports that the depreciation in the value of the crops in Ireland for the year 1882, in consequence of the unfavorable harvest, aggregated the sum of £5,118,167, as compared with the favorable year of 1881, and £2,527,664 as compared with the average of the preceding ten years. The bulk of the loss was on the potato crop, which was £4,317,687 as compared with the year 1881, and £2,274,431 as compared with the average for the preceding ten years.

A great number of arrests were made in Dublin on Friday evening and Saturday morning under the Crimes Act. A number of the persons arrested had arms in their possession, and are charged with conspiracy to murder. The arrests were effected in various parts of the city. The prisoners are principally of the artisan class. The police are still following various alleged "clews" to the Phoenix Park assassins. Knives, said to have been used in the murder, were found behind the house of one of the prisoners arrested on Friday and Saturday, and the authorities are said to be convinced that they are the identical ones used; but as one of the proofs is that they "fit the cuts in the clothes of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke," not much reliance can be placed upon this report. The authorities, finding that there was no chance of bringing the guilt home to any one of them, have decided to group all of the prisoners together on a general charge of conspiracy. Most of them were arrested on information received that they belonged to a secret society which held a special meeting in Dublin, and had resolved to assassinate certain of the more active members of the Dublin police force. One of the prisoners is a man named Carey, a member of the Dublin Municipality, who has long been suspected of being concerned in some of the worst proceedings of the revolutionists.

In the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice on Thursday, Mr. Justice Field gave judgment against Mr. Charles Bradlaugh in his action against Mr. Henry D. Erskine, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Commons, for an assault on the occasion of Mr. Bradlaugh attempting to enter the House of Commons and take his seat as a member for Northampton Borough, after a resolution had been passed prohibiting him from so doing. Mr. Justice Field cited precedents showing the power of the House to control its own proceedings.

The Crown Prince and Princess of Germany have declined to receive any presents at their silver wedding, and request those who proposed to make them to spend their money in alleviating the distress caused by the inundation.

The town of Raab, Hungary, was inundated on Tuesday, the 9th. A considerable number of lives were lost, and the inhabitants abandoned the town. Several villages in the neighborhood of Raab have been ruined by the floods. In the Hungarian Diet on Wednesday Herr Tisza, Minister of the Interior and President of the Council, stated that he had sanctioned the payment of the sums of money required to relieve the wants of sufferers by the inundation of Raab, and that private charity

had also begun the work of relief. It is officially reported that 10,000 persons are now roofless, and that between 300 and 400 houses are inundated and partially destroyed. The Prussian Landtag has voted a grant of 3,000,000 marks for the relief of the sufferers in the inundated districts. On Friday the despatches said that a portion of the city of Gran, on the Danube, was flooded, and that there would certainly be a famine in the inundated districts of Hungary unless assistance was prompt. The extent of the flooded country in the Middle Rhine district, exclusive of the tributaries of the river, is computed at 700 square kilometres. The Emperor William has increased his contribution from the imperial funds for the relief of the sufferers from the flood to 600,000 marks. On Tuesday a despatch from Pesth stated that the Danube had subsided everywhere above Mohacs, but the fugitives could not return to their homes, as their houses were destroyed or filled with ice.

The Spanish Cortes reassembled on Wednesday. Señor Sagasta, President of the Council, addressing the Senate, said the new Ministry would adopt the financial policy of Señor Camacho, the late Minister of Finance, except in regard to the sale of property of the State. The budget for the current year, he said, would show a surplus. The payment of the interest on the public debt would be secured without having to resort to a sale of State forest lands. The new Minister of Justice, Señor Giron, announced at a Cabinet council on Thursday that he proposes to abolish the hanging of women; also the suppression of newspapers, leaving suspension the highest press penalty. The new Minister for the Colonies has informed the Cuban representative in the Chamber of Deputies that in all social and political questions he will follow the policy of his predecessor.

The police in Rome on Friday evening made domiciliary visits to 135 houses and arrested 125 persons. They also made sixty-two seizures of newspapers containing revolutionary accounts of Overdank's life and so-called martyrdom. It is believed that the arrests will lead to the discovery of important information.

Italy has demanded from the Porte redress for a recent affront to a servant of the Italian Consul at Tripoli, and Count Corti, the Italian Ambassador at Constantinople, has been instructed to make representations in regard to certain false reports which caused the Porte to demand the recall of the Italian Consul.

A despatch from London on Monday said that telegrams from official sources in Constantinople reported that some Circassians attempted on Sunday to assassinate the Sultan. A woman divulged the plot. The Albanian body-guard met and defeated the Circassians in the vicinity of the Sultan's apartments. Several men were killed in the encounter.

A despatch from Sofia on Monday said that the reports that preparations are making for an early rising of the Mussulmans in the mountain districts of Eastern Rumelia have been confirmed. The authorities have seized several cases of Martini rifles sent by the "Young Turkey Committee" at Constantinople to a committee in Philippopolis. Turkish troops have been clandestinely massed on the Eastern Rumelian frontier.

The Russian budget for 1883 estimates the receipts at 778,500,000 rubles, and the expenditure at 100,000 rubles less. Accompanying the budget is a report which says a loan will be unnecessary. An improvement of the financial situation, although difficult, is not impossible, in view of the peaceful yet firm attitude pursued by the Government abroad, and the prosperity of internal affairs.

A disastrous fire occurred at Berditsheff, in Russian Poland, on Saturday. A circus was burned during the performance, and when crowded with people. It is estimated that 90 men, 120 women, and 6 children lost their lives.

THE SILVER QUESTION.

SENATOR MORRILL, in his speech introducing the tariff amendments proposed by the Finance Committee, gave a statement of the probable expenditures of the Government for the next fiscal year, in order to show how far it would be possible to reduce taxation. Among those expenditures he mentioned the item of \$24,000,000 for the purchase of silver bullion. He said that there was no probability that this expense would be discontinued, and that consequently the taxes must be high enough to cover that amount, together with other necessary disbursements. He showed that under the steady operation of the silver-coinage act two millions per month of the public revenue are swallowed up without yielding any benefit whatever. This money, if applied to the extinguishment of the public debt, would reduce the interest charge nearly one million dollars per year. But against this possible saving we are confronted with the fact that the silver which we have bought for coinage during the past four years has depreciated on our hands six or eight per cent., and that we have already lost several million dollars on the transaction. Moreover, if we should attempt to sell our silver, the price would probably fall six or eight per cent. more. In short, we have got ourselves into the same bad fix that the German and French Governments were in when we began our crazy experiment.

Yet the wasteful process goes on month after month, and Mr. Morrill sees no present prospect of its discontinuance. It is true that the House Committee on Banking and Currency reported a bill last spring to stop the coinage, and the Senate passed a bill which would have that effect, viz., the bill to abolish "permanent appropriations." This bill ought to be passed independently of its effect upon the silver coinage, the appropriations over which Congress does not exercise any control having risen to more than \$15,000,000 per annum, exclusive of the interest on the public debt and the silver coinage. Including these items, the permanent appropriations amount to \$146,000,000 per annum, or one-half of the entire expenditures of the Government. If the permanent appropriations were repealed, and Congress were asked to vote \$24,000,000, or any other sum, out of the people's earnings every year for the purchase of bullion—either silver or gold—it is our belief that no such vote would ever be given. The purchase of bullion by the Government is now nothing but a subsidy to the owners of silver mines.

The question is often asked how long this senseless coinage can continue without bringing on a cataclysm, a crisis, a change in the monetary standard of the country. This is a difficult question to answer. If the country were poor, so poor that it could not afford to lay aside \$24,000,000 per annum of idle capital in the Treasury vaults, but must needs realize upon it somehow, the strain would have brought on a crisis long ago. The Government would have been obliged to force these silver dollars upon its creditors, and enormous confusion would have been produced by the attempt to make two things of different values circulate side by side at the

same value. But the country being rich and able to sink \$24,000,000 per year in an idle investment, the only mischief to be anticipated, aside from the waste of capital, arises from the chance that political changes may bring somebody to the head of affairs who will conceive it his duty to pay out these silver dollars, which are now worth eighty-two cents, and may then be worth only seventy-five, at par. Such a proceeding would be calamitous in its effects upon the public credit, and would produce a grave commercial if not social conflict. The losses inflicted, directly and indirectly, by a battle of the standards taking place in all business circles simultaneously would probably be greater than would be incurred by taking all the silver dollars to the middle of the Atlantic and throwing them overboard. So long, however, as no steps are taken to force silver into circulation, no greater harm can come than wasting our treasure and making ourselves a laughing-stock for the nations.

We have now accumulated a larger stock of unused silver than Germany holds, and about one-half the amount that burdens France. The price of silver has fallen three per cent. within a few weeks, and the chance of its advancing is very slight. On the other hand, the production is likely to increase as the mines of Mexico are provided with railroad transportation and exploited with modern machinery. We shall soon be buying our two millions per month from that country, if we are not doing so now, because she will be able to furnish it cheaper than Colorado or Nevada. It is estimated by good authority that one-half of all the silver in the world has been produced by Mexican mines, and that they are capable of yielding more in the future than they have in the past. The Paris Conference of 1881, which adjourned for one year without doing anything, has since adjourned *sine die*, thus dissipating all hope of international remonetization on either a large or a small scale. In short, the outlook for further speculation in silver is most unpromising, while the collateral dangers to trade are increasing with the growth of our already enormous hoard of unused dollars.

It seems wonderful that no steps are taken in Congress to bring the bill which the Banking Committee reported last year to a vote. Perhaps it would be defeated; but what is wanted most of all is such a discussion of the subject as shall lead to an expression of public opinion upon the question in its present aspects. Two months ago nothing seemed more unlikely than that the Pendleton bill to reform the civil service would be passed by both houses of Congress. No one can say with certainty that a similar awakening of good sense may not be brought about by a fresh debate on the silver question.

MORE ABOUT SOUTHERN HOMICIDE.

AN article in the Lynchburg *Virginian*, suggested by the result of a trial for a "late unhappy homicide" in that city, is in form "a plea for a higher civilization," but in its protests against the practice of carrying deadly weapons, and using them on slight provocation, it indirectly admits the truth of

nearly everything we have been saying of late in the *Nation* about the cause and consequence of Southern homicide. Efforts have been made by some Southern newspapers, as well as by correspondents writing to us, to dispose of our strictures by pointing to the magnitude of crime in general at the North as well as to the Dukes-Nutt homicide in Pennsylvania; by citing comparative statistics of crime and its punishment at the North and South from the New York *Tribune*, which have, we believe, not the slightest weight or authority; and, finally—which is the queerest of all—by ascribing our remonstrances with Southern men against shooting each other on sight to our interest in some land speculation in the Northwest.

Southern men have been accused of want of humor, but no community can be so wanting in that respect as to believe that, if one remonstrates with them on their readiness to shed blood on slight provocation, it must be due to some sinister motive. What we have been discussing, we repeat, is not crime in general at either the North or South. We acknowledge that, as regards crime in general, the South cuts a very respectable figure beside any community in the world. Nor have we been dealing with the crimes of the vicious, or depraved, or dissolute, which endanger only those who keep bad company, and contact with which decent people can readily avoid by keeping out of bad company. The matter on which we have been commenting, we again repeat, is the readiness of Southern farmers, lawyers, merchants, and doctors—men in good social and business standing, whom a respectable immigrant must have for neighbors, and must meet in society and business, whether he will or no—to settle disputes and avenge social slights with the pistol or the knife, and not in regular duels either, but by chance encounters on the public streets or highroads. Add to this the refusal of Southern juries to punish these offenders, and the failure of Southern society to give protection, sympathy, or aid to a peaceable man whose life is threatened by an armed enemy.

Nor can the force of what we have been saying be lessened by decrying us as malignant slanderers or defamers of the South. The South has no truer or older friends than we. There are, too, no warmer admirers of whatever is admirable—and there is a great deal—in Southern character and manners. It is because we have for so many years been contending for the things which make for Southern peace and dignity and prosperity, against those whose dislike and distrust survived both slavery and the war, that we now make an earnest plea for the extirpation within her borders of the thing which enables her enemies with a show of reason to place her in the category of semi-barbarous states.

We have published a good many interesting communications from Southerners, acknowledging, describing, or explaining the evil in question. The best men at the South not only deplore, but abhor it and would fain get rid of it. The best portion of the newspaper press talks in the same strain. But no one can read either the letters or articles without being impressed by the writers' sense of inability to

do anything toward cure beyond the utterance of an occasional mild remonstrance. The difficulties of doing even this are well illustrated by the following characteristic warning addressed by the *Richmond State* to two of our correspondents—Virginians of high character and culture, and of good social standing, who ventured on a partial acknowledgment of the truth of our charges and on a calm discussion of them in our columns:

"So plausible and so cunningly contrived has been the *Nation's* trickery that it has recently published letters of commendation from two individuals in Virginia—one of them writing from Richmond—who were either fools or knaves, being either too silly to detect the injury that paper is doing our people, or too treacherous to refrain from endorsing slanders against their own friends and neighbors. Their affected 'liberalism,' however, is made naught by the exposure of the *Nation's* over-zeal in its foul work of abuse, and these two writers from Virginia, if they be real and known, should not fail to suffer the penalty of their treachery, and be forced, as the slanderers of their own people, to remain forever renegades from society, unworthy of the trust of honest men."

Here we have a thinly disguised threat of "boycotting," or worse (indeed one almost sees the stock of the shotgun sticking out of it), directed, in terms worthy of the Molly Maguires, against any Southerner who even admits that there is too much unpunished homicide at the South. The editor clearly writes under the influence of the tradition of a time when there was only one social question at the South, on which only one opinion could safely be permitted, and when agitation or public discussion of anything but the best means of protecting slavery was unknown. Apparently the art of agitation, or, in other words, the art of putting down an evil, whether of society or government, through organized machinery of persuasion, has still to be introduced into that region. Men who feel the need of change are still unable or unwilling to combine for the promotion of it through public discussion. At the North or in England, if there were as much sentiment hostile to the carrying of deadly weapons and their use in the settlement of private differences as there undoubtedly is at the South, associations would be formed of persons pledged to refrain from carrying them themselves, and to persuade others not to do so, to protect their members against assaults and threats by the enforcement of the law, to enlighten the class from which jurymen come as to the moral and social and commercial value of security; and to raise among the young the conception of the duties and responsibilities of citizenship by speeches, books, pamphlets, and newspapers, in season and out of season, until the victory was won.

The notion, for instance—which one of our Southern correspondents describes as still current at the South, and at the bottom of much of the homicide—that an enemy who speaks ill of you must be "punished," might readily be shown to be a survival of the notion on which all savage society rests—that the punishment of enemies is man's chief business. The Indians and Turcomans of our time do little else. They devote their lives to punishing enemies, to preparing food for consumption while punishing them, and to talking about them, and singing songs about them. The growth of civilization in a community may, in fact, be measured, with almost mathematical

accuracy, by the diminution of the amount of time and attention spent by its members on enemies, and on their doings and sayings, and in keeping up a reputation for physical courage as a warning to them. In the most highly civilized States to-day the foremost classes give little or no attention to enemies at all. They are too busy with commerce, science, literature, and politics to bother about them. They do not care what an enemy says, and do not mind what he does, as long as he is not in debt to them. They keep up a disciplined police force to catch him and lock him up if he gets drunk, or threatens violence, or goes about calling names in the street. But they no more think of carrying arms in readiness for him, and laying ambuscades for him, or challenging him if he uses bad language, than of taking off their tailors' clothing, putting on a breech-clout and red ochre, and riding round with a long spear on a thin pony. Surely, it ought not to be difficult to convince the young men of a race which has produced Washington and Marshall that the time has come for the South, too, to take its place as to this matter "in the foremost files of time."

DOCTOR AND JUDGE.

A YEAR ago, the Senate of this State passed a resolution requesting the Attorney-General and the State Commissioner in Lunacy to report to the Legislature such amendments to the laws relating to the insane as might seem to them advisable. These two officials requested the Medico-Legal Society to assist them by making suggestions on the subject, and this society has now made a report, in which it recommends a good many changes.

It shows that the law of 1874, which regulates the incarceration of persons alleged to be insane, does not provide sufficient safeguards against abuse. The law requires the certificate of two physicians, under oath, and the approval within five days by a judge of a court of record. But whether the judge shall conduct any inquiry, or shall rely entirely on the physicians' certificates, seems to be left wholly in his discretion. The language of the statute is: "Said judge or justice may institute inquiry, and take proofs as to any alleged lunacy before approving or disapproving of such certificate, and said judge or justice may, in his discretion, call a jury in each case to determine the question of lunacy." With regard to the qualifications of physicians for the delicate task of giving a certificate of insanity, the law provides that practice for three years shall be enough.

The Society objects to both these provisions. It says as to the first that no judge ought to have any discretion in the matter, but should be compelled to hold an inquiry, so that there shall always be a judicial determination of the existence of lunacy sufficient to call for confinement in an asylum. As to the second, it insists that no physician should be allowed to certify to insanity who is not an expert alienist, and that such expert ought to be selected beforehand by some competent commission or tribunal for the work.

We suppose that no sensible man will deny that a three-years' practice is an utterly insufficient qualification for the performance of a

medical duty of this kind. A three-years' practice means a young man, fresh from a medical school or from walking some hospital, and devoid of all experience in mental disease. It is, of course, no answer to this objection that in a vast majority of cases physicians of experience are called in. All that has to be shown is that now and then—before a negligent judge, for instance—abuses might occur. But abuses might also occur if we took the measures advocated by the Society, and required the certificate of two accomplished alienists in every case. In some respects an accomplished alienist is as dangerous a man as an inexperienced young doctor. The study of mental disease predisposes him to discover symptoms of insanity in persons perfectly capable of managing their own affairs; and occasionally we see criminals hanged and wills of eccentric old millionaires sustained, in the teeth of evidence by unquestionably eminent experts that they have been for years hopelessly irresponsible, and incapable of managing their affairs. The fact is, that to make out clearly whether a man ought to be shut up or not, the thing most needed is experience, not so much of mental disease as of the man himself, his habits, character, mind, and temperament. It is on this account that in courts of justice the evidence of family physicians, who have had a long familiarity with the patient, is always regarded as of so much more importance than the testimony of experts. But every alleged lunatic has not a family physician, so that this evidence is not accessible in ordinary cases.

The difficulties, however, which surround this branch of the subject would in a great measure disappear, if the judge were in all cases compelled to institute an inquiry of some kind into the allegation of insanity. The necessity of throwing a greater responsibility upon him than he now has appears from a consideration that the Society seems to have overlooked. The final decision ought to be made by somebody who is absolutely impartial, and this the physicians seldom or never are. In nine cases out of ten they are called in and employed by the patient's family for the express purpose of discovering insanity. They would be more than human if the desire of those who retain and pay them for their work did not affect their minds. We know how this is with regard to experts in court, who are paid large fees by one side or the other, and it must be so to a considerable extent in ordinary lunacy cases. For this reason, if there were no other, the judge ought never to be allowed to rely exclusively on the physicians' certificate. The physicians' certificate is merely evidence—evidence of great importance, to be sure, but which should be sifted like other evidence. The act which finally consigns the alleged lunatic to an asylum, should be the act of a court deciding judicially, as in all other cases in which the question of lunacy arises, upon the value of this evidence. The process of depriving a man of his liberty and the management of his property ought at least to be surrounded by as many safeguards as that of testing the validity of the disposition he has made of his property by will.

We doubt whether the suggestion of the Society that all lunatics confined in asylums should at any time have the right to an impartial medical investigation into their mental state without expense to themselves, on the ground that they may possibly have recovered, is practicable. A large proportion of the lunatics in the world always believe themselves to be sane, and in case this recommendation were adopted, we should have a vast number of wholly unnecessary investigations demanded. In fact, inquiries into their mental condition at the expense of the State would become a regular asylum pastime. On the other hand, examinations of asylums at stated intervals, by competent impartial experts, which the Society also recommends, seems highly desirable.

THE ANTI-BOUQUET MOVEMENT.

THE recent development of symptoms of hostility to bouquets on the part of Society cannot have failed to attract the attention of those who watch for significant social changes. This winter the young of both sexes have been startled by receiving invitations to parties, winding up with a request that girls will not carry bouquets. The object is understood to be to relieve dancing men of the feeling that it is necessary for them, if they invite any one to dance the german, to send an expensive bouquet. The german code has become in this respect, since the war, very rigorous. A man cannot invite a girl to dance the german without sending a bouquet, and consequently girls who come to a party unprovided with partners do not get any. Meanwhile the expense has gradually increased until dancing a single german has come to cost from twenty to fifty dollars. That numbers of worthy young men, just as well fitted by nature for german partners as any others, are deterred from dancing it by the expense, seems to be admitted, and of course it tends, like all social expenses of the kind, to become heavier and heavier. Whatever may be the precise nature of the impression produced by bouquets upon the feminine fancy, the commonplace young man, if wealthy—and the wealthy are so often otherwise commonplace—is able, by the mere use of money, to send a bigger bouquet, and thus produce more impression than the clever and attractive young man whose resources are slender. The latter, however, if his moral nature is not exceptionally strong, will always be tempted to imitate the extravagance of his rich rival, and thus he is apt to send bouquets more expensive than he can afford. The bouquet tax for an energetic and constant german dancer mounts up easily to many hundred dollars a year, a considerable slice of any poor young dancer's income. No doubt many a young performer whom we see gravely and seriously revolving in the mazes of the dance at Delmonico's is bitterly counting the cost, and wondering by what means, fair or foul, he can meet it. Indeed, the decline of the gayety and high spirits which used to be one of the principal charms of round dancing, and the general taciturnity and melancholy of dancing men, are believed by many observers to be due to the thoughts which the sight of unpaid-for

bouquets inspires. Many a young defaulter, as he looks back on the causes which led to his downfall, remembers with terrible distinctness his first bouquet.

For the moral consequences of bouquet-giving, however, Society would probably care very little. But the expense has now reached a point which is beginning to tell on the nerve of the masculine performer. A custom which makes dancing men more and more shy is plainly full of danger to Society itself. The time when either the practice must be abolished, or when the german must be confined exclusively to the wealthy, is believed by many to have come. Of course, if the right to dance the german could be confined to the wealthy, there would be no need of troubling ourselves with the matter at all. But to confine it in this way would be fatal, for as the rivalry in bouquet-giving grew more and more intense, the class having sufficient means to provide flowers in the continually increasing amounts required would grow smaller and smaller, until in the end it would probably be confined to the families of a few old exclusive Knickerbockers of Pacific Coast origin.

The view taken of the bouquet by girls is of course closely connected with that taken by men. One is the reverse of the other. The girl's view of the subject is now a purely business view. The highest and most conclusive evidence of a girl's popularity is the number of bouquets she carries at a party. It is a solid tribute, estimable in money, and easily comparable in value with the trophies of other girls. The idea of sentiment being connected with it has for a long time been subordinated to its business aspect. It is said even that many leading modern girls discourage any such idea, because what they desire is numerous bouquets, of at least a standard size and expense, as evidence of attention. It is said, too, that very prudent girls do not consider it safe to go to a party with a single bouquet, because it implies, instead of an extensive vogue among men, that a sentiment exists which binds them to one, and is therefore calculated to frighten away the others. But this is probably an exaggeration. However this may be, there is no doubt that it was idle to expect reform on the subject of bouquets from girls except under pressure. No girl would ever be likely, in replying to an invitation for the german, to add to her note, "Kindly omit flowers." Men cannot break up the custom except in one way—that of holding aloof from the german altogether. This, it seems, they begin to show some symptoms of doing, and in order to prevent this calamity attempts are now being made to recall girls to a sense of their position.

Hence it is that we hear of the rise of an anti-bouquet movement, which enthusiastic reformers predict will not only rescue the young dancing man from the thralldom from which he now suffers, but do something to re-establish in the minds of women the old sentimental view of flowers—that their value was not dependent upon size and quantity, but on other considerations of a different order. Of course, with old girls who have fixed ideas on the subject, and regard bouquets simply as the best evidence, in a community governed by commercial standards, of social success, no change of feeling is likely to occur. They may pretend

to like the reform, and go to parties without bouquets, but secretly they will pine for the old system and do what they can to perpetuate it. A hardened girl really likes social reform no more than a city politician likes reform in municipal government. But with very young girls it is different. They may be taught possibly to look on bouquets in the old sentimental way, and even to acquire a contempt for the strictly commercial view of them.

Girls capable of reflection will perceive that a choice must be made, sooner or later, between the business and the sentimental view of bouquets. All the poetical associations connected with bouquets are of course destroyed the moment the idea of obligation arises. If a man need not send a bouquet unless he desires to do so, his sending one is a delicate compliment. It implies that he has singled out the person to whom he sends it as the one of all others whom he wishes to please. It is the prettiest proof that can be given of this desire. But an obligatory bouquet suggests nothing, as we have seen, except the bill. Indeed, as the custom exists at present, the girl might as well get the bouquet herself and send the bill to her partner; obligatory bouquets can only be used for purposes of display, and display is fatal to sentiment. As a sentimental nation, our whole manner of dealing with flowers is open to criticism. But we must confine ourselves now to the bouquet question. What we have said sufficiently shows that any girl who joins the anti-bouquet movement and "swears off," will be striking a blow for sentiment in a society on which it is sadly losing its hold, and in her effort at reform she will receive the cordial encouragement of those whose admiration she values most.

THE LATE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY AND HIS SUCCESSOR.

LONDON, Dec. 24, 1882.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury, which became vacant by the death of Dr. Tait three weeks ago, has at last been filled. It is so much the most considerable ecclesiastical post in the British world, and indeed so unique a post in Europe, that American readers may probably like to hear something about its character and position in our public religious life, as well as about the personal attributes of the deceased prelate and his newly-chosen successor.

Ever since there was a bishop at Canterbury at all—that is to say, ever since the conversion of the English began in the seventh century of our era—he has been the greatest ecclesiastical personage in these islands, with a recognized authority over all England, and an influence and dignity to which the Archbishops of Armagh and St. Andrew's (heads of the Irish and Scottish Churches) practically bowed, even while refusing to admit his legal supremacy. To be the greatest and most powerful man in the churches of Britain, in days when the Church was far better organized, and in some ways far more powerful, than the State, meant a vast deal. He was, in fact, and was often so called, a pope of his own world—that world of Britain which lay apart from the larger world of the European continent. Down till the Reformation, the archbishops possessed immense power, and were sometimes a match for the kings. Many of them were the leading statesmen of their time—Dunstan, Lanfranc, Anselm, Thomas Becket,

Stephen Langton, Warham, were the foremost figures in the England of their day. After Henry VIII's breach with Rome, the Primate of England became in so far more dignified as he was more independent of the Pope; but, of course, the loss of Church power and Church wealth which the Reformation caused lowered his importance. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, however, there were still some conspicuous and powerful prelates at Canterbury—Cranmer and Laud the best remembered among them. After the Revolution of 1688, a time of smaller men begins. The office retained its dignity as the highest place open to a subject, ranking above the Lord Chancellor or the President of the Council, but the Church of England was in a stagnant condition, and it mattered but little who her chief pastor was.

Bishoprics were in those days regarded chiefly as pieces of rich preferment with which prime ministers bought the support of powerful adherents. Of late years, as the Anglican Church has become at once more threatened and more energetic, as more of the life of the nation has flowed into her and round her, the office of a bishop has become more important: people are far more interested in the appointments made, and ministers have become proportionately careful in making them. Bishops work harder and are more in the public eye now than they were fifty, or even twenty, years ago. They have lost something of the antique dignity and social consideration which they enjoyed, but they have also gained by having countless opportunities opened up to them for exerting influence in philanthropic as well as in religious movements; and the abler and more active among them turn these opportunities to excellent account. Whatever is true of an ordinary bishop is true *à fortiori* of the Archbishop of Canterbury. He is still a great personage, but he is great in a new way. There is far less deference paid to his office, considered simply as an office, than in former generations, because society and thought are more democratic, and people see that all offices are only human creations, whose occupants are people just like themselves. But if he is himself a man of ability and force, he may turn his place to admirable account by using it as a platform whence to address the nation; he is sure of being listened to, which is of itself no small matter in a country where so many voices are striving to make themselves heard at the same time. The world takes his words into serious consideration, the newspapers repeat them. His position gives him easy access to the ministers of the crown, to the crown itself, to all who in any way can influence the march of events, and enables him to enforce his views upon them. All his conduct is watched by the nation; so that if it is discreet, provident, animated by high and consistent principle, he gets full credit, and acquires that influence which masses of men are eager to acknowledge whenever they can persuade themselves that it is deserved. Now, the English people is more interested in ecclesiastical and in theological matters now than it was fifty years ago; it is more inclined to observe ecclesiastical persons and read about theological subjects. Hence a strong archbishop, a prelate of character, rectitude, and utterance, is in a far more conspicuously influential position now than he was then; his personality is a more important factor in the history of his own time.

Needless to say that all this makes the selection of a bishop a more delicate and troublesome business than it was in the good old times. Seventy years ago the great recommendation for a see was the possession of some social or political influence which the minister could attach to himself by the gift of preferment. If

the person was also a good Greek scholar—had edited some plays of Euripides, for instance—so much the better. If he was a man of piety, that also was well. Thirty years ago the possession of piety and of a talent for preaching had become much more important qualifications, but the main thing was moderation. A bishop must first and foremost be a cautious and guarded man, having nothing decided about his views, and concealing what he had. His chief virtue was to be the negative one of offending no section by expressing the distinctive views of any other. In the alarm created by the Tractarian movement, there was a tendency to appoint Low Churchmen, but since that panic has passed away the moderate High Church has had its share. Nor has even the Broad Church been left entirely unprovided for. One may say that the last and now prevailing theory of bishop-making is to give every party its turn, but to choose from every party the most judicious and least violent men. On the whole, this is a good plan, but it often results in the nomination of mediocrities, men chosen more because they are safe than because they are able.

As the Primate's is more important than any other episcopal chair, so is the difficulty of choosing its occupant proportionately greater. His acts and words are so closely scrutinized that he must be a very prudent and cautious man, yet not so much so as to give the impression of timidity. He must be conciliating, yet able to put his foot down and take a decided attitude. In order to do justice to all parties and sections of the Church of England, he must not be an avowed partisan of any. Yet he must be able and eminent, and of course able and eminent men are apt to throw themselves into some one line of action or set of views, and so come to be considered partisans. The position which the Archbishop of Canterbury holds as a member of the House of Lords, and the representative there of the whole Established Church, makes statesmanship the most important of all qualifications. Learning, energy, eloquence, piety, are secondary matters, because none of them, nor all of them together, would make up for the want of worldly prudence. Yet, of course, they are all very desirable, because they strengthen as well as adorn the prelate's position.

Dr. Tait, whom the See of Canterbury has just lost, united several of these qualifications in a high degree. He was, if it be not a paradox to say so, more remarkable as an archbishop than as a man. He had no original power as a thinker. He was not a striking preacher, and the more he prepared his sermons the less interesting they became. He was so far from being learned that you could say no more of him than that he was a passable scholar and a fairly well-informed man. He was pious, but in a quiet, almost a dry, way, which had in it nothing that impressed or inspired others. If he had remained in a subordinate position, had been all his life a college tutor at Oxford, or canon of some cathedral, he would have discharged the duties of that position in a thoroughly satisfactory way; but no one would have felt that Fate had dealt unfairly with him in depriving him of some larger career and loftier post. No one, indeed, who knew him when he was a college tutor seems to have predicted the dignities he was destined to attain. In what, then, did the secret of his success lie—the secret, that is, of his acquitting himself so excellently in those dignities as to have become almost a model to this generation of what an Archbishop of Canterbury ought to be? In the statesmanlike quality of his mind. He had not merely moderation, but what, though often confounded with moderation, is something different, something rarer and better, temperance of mind. He was not

carried away by impulses or seduced by any one theory so as to lose sight of other views and conditions which had to be regarded. He knew how to be firm without vehemence, prudent without timidity, judicious without coldness. He was, above all things, a singularly just man, who recognized every one's rights, and never sought to overbear them by an exercise of authority. He was as ready to listen to his opponents as to his friends. Indeed, he so held himself as to appear to have no opponents, but to be rather a judge before whom different advocates are stating their respective cases, than a minister seeking to make his own views or his own party prevail. You could hardly call him genial, for there was little effusiveness, little display of emotion in his manner; yet he was kindly, always desiring to believe the good rather than the evil, and to lead people instead of driving them. And with this he was perfectly candid and straightforward, saying no more than was necessary, but never saying anything he had occasion to be ashamed of. He sometimes made mistakes, but they were not mistakes of the heart, and, being free from vanity or self-conceit, he was willing in a quiet way to admit them and to alter his course accordingly. Thus his character by degrees gained upon the nation, and even the clergy, who are of course always the most critical, and even bitter, in their comments on any ecclesiastical who does not accept their special doctrines, gradually came to respect and admire him. There can be no doubt that his influence has gone a considerable way to strengthen the political position of the Established Church, and to keep its several parties from breaking out into more open hostility with one another. He was himself what we should call a moderate Broad Churchman, leaning more to the Evangelical than to the Tractarian or Romanizing views in matters of doctrine. At one time the extreme High Churchmen regarded him as an enemy. But this animosity had almost died away, except among a few fierce partisans, when the death of his wife and his only son, followed by his own long illness, stifled the voices of criticism.

He exerted very great influence in the House of Lords chiefly by the firmness of his character and the consistency of his public course, but also by his powers of speech, which, matured as they were by long practice, had risen to a very high level. Without eloquence, without imagination or passion, which are the chief elements in eloquence, he had a grave, weighty, thoughtful style of speaking which profoundly impressed an audience. His diction was plain, yet pure and dignified, his matter well considered; he spoke as one who fully believed every word he said. The late Bishop of Winchester, the famous Dr. Samuel Wilberforce, was incomparably his superior as an orator, but no less inferior in his power over the House of Lords, so little does mere brilliance go for in a critical and practical assembly. For every one felt in listening how great was the difference between the solidity, the elevation, the unswerving truthfulness of the one, and the unstable character of the other.

To follow such a man as Dr. Tait is not easy; so there has been no surprise at the long delay in naming his successor. Dr. Benson, Bishop of Truro (one of those new sees which have lately been created by Act of Parliament), is at least a respectable nomination. He is personally a far less remarkable man than Dr. Lightfoot, Bishop of Durham, who is not only our greatest living English Biblical scholar, but also a person of a singularly winning and attractive character. However, Dr. Lightfoot has occupied his see for so short a time that it may, perhaps, have been thought he lacked experience for the primacy; or his writings on the New Testament and early

Church history may be thought to have been somewhat too liberal in their tendencies. Those who know him best most regret that he was not chosen; as those who know what great popular gifts, what force, what geniality, what a power of showing sympathy with the masses and evoking it from them have been displayed by the Bishop of Manchester think that a mistake has been made in not raising him to a place where these gifts would have had their largest field. But Dr. Benson is a man of ability and honesty, against whom there is nothing to be said except that he has not yet shown any such conspicuous merits as to account for his promotion. He is a decided, but not extreme, High Churchman, was formerly head master of a large public school, and subsequently made himself liked and valued both as Chancellor of the Cathedral of Lincoln and as Bishop of the new Cornish Diocese of Truro. He is a sound scholar and a good preacher, apparently also a sensible man, who will not get into scrapes. The position of the Anglican Church, and the attacks from within and without to which it is exposed, will need much judgment and coolness from its new chief. Y.

CANT AND CONSTITUTIONALISM.

LONDON, December 19, 1882.

Is there any true connection between the prevalence of political cant and the existence of a constitutional form of government?

Carlyle certainly believed that the vice which he specially denounced was connected by more than an accidental relationship with the polity which he specially despised. One may disagree with Carlyle's theories, one may think lightly of the wisdom of a dyspeptic philosopher who was apt to make the state of his own digestion the measure of all things, human and divine. But it is difficult for a candid critic to get rid of the conviction that Carlyle's denunciations of constitutionalism as a sham, and the parent of shams, have in them an element of truth which political thinkers ought to disengage from the mass of exaggeration and bombast in which, like most others of Carlyle's half-truths, it has been concealed.

Cant—as distinguished from the quite different vice hypocrisy—is the use of formulas which, whether true or not in themselves, convey no real idea, and do not correspond with any genuine or well-founded belief on the part of the speaker who uses them. To “cant” is not to lie, but to repeat words which, though they may have a meaning to others, or may in other ages have borne significance which they no longer possess, do not represent any genuine or real meaning on your part. To clear your mind of cant is to take care that you are not deceived by words, to attach a distinct sense to every word you speak, to make it your aim that your expressions shall tally with your thoughts, and that your thoughts themselves shall, as far as possible, correspond with the nature of things. This kind of veracity, which is something different from what is ordinarily meant by truthfulness, is nurtured by the habit of calling a spade a spade; it is imperilled by any custom which involves the use of names, words, or ceremonies which do not answer to actual facts. Constitutionalism, on the other hand, as developed at any rate in England, is an attempt, and a singularly successful attempt, to transform without destroying a mediæval scheme of government into a polity suited to the wants of an industrial age. The curiosity of the thing, its charm to antiquarians, is, that the English Constitution has preserved the ceremonies, the formulas, the phrases, the outward show, even to a limited extent the political sentiment, appropriate to a mediæval monarchy, in combination

with, or rather as the mask of, institutions compatible with that sovereignty of the people which forms the essence of modern democracy.

One main rule of the art by which this singular transformation has been performed is, that a change of things should never, if possible, involve a change of names. Constantly to modify institutions, never to alter titles and forms, has been and is half the secret of English statesmanship. This system, which has constantly enabled England to substitute reform for revolution, has, with some grave practical evils, still greater practical advantages; but no one who has eyes in his head, or a brain to note the bearing of what he observes, can doubt that English constitutionalism does lead to confusion both in act and in thought between form and reality. That this is so must, I think, have been patent to any person of reflecting mind who, on the 4th of this month, was present at the opening of the new Law Courts. The ceremony was as striking as any ever witnessed in England. The event itself had a real, genuine, and unmistakable importance, for it was the outward recognition of a revolution in the administration of the law of England which may produce effects of far greater permanent consequence than result from political alterations which excite popular enthusiasm, or strokes of statesmanship which give celebrity to the name of a minister. But the most extraordinary feature in an impressive scene was the unreality of the antiquated forms used to celebrate a great modern innovation or improvement in the law of England. Of all the persons engaged in the pageant, the one who presumably knew least about the law, who had certainly least to do with its administration, and had the least power of influencing the course or the development of the law was the royal lady in whose name justice is administered. Yet with that admirable or wonderful belief in forms which characterizes Englishmen, the official language employed throughout the whole of the grand ceremonial implied that the Queen possessed an authority and even took a part in the administration of law which her Majesty would be the last person in the United Kingdom either to exercise or to claim. If language were, in matters constitutional, the representation of fact, it might be inferred from the transactions of the 4th of this month that in 1882 Queen Victoria possessed and exerted powers somewhat greater than the authority which in 1582 was exerted by Queen Elizabeth.

To add to the innocent irony of the situation, it happened that while the Queen was treated as though she had in fact all the powers of sovereignty ever wielded by the most despotic of her predecessors, the Prime Minister, who is more truly than any other one person the governor of the country, had as Premier (the Premiership being entirely unknown to the Constitution) no place in the ceremony of the day. Mr. Gladstone took part in the pageant not because he was Prime Minister, but because he was Chancellor of the Exchequer. He came, in short, to the opening of the Royal Courts not in virtue of being what he is—the head of the British Government—but in virtue of the pretence of his being what he is not and never has been and never will be—an English judge. No fact can illustrate more forcibly the antiquarianism and therefore of necessity the unreality which infects the whole ceremonial of the English Constitution. That this antiquarianism is not only venerable but often useful, chiefly because it enables us to avoid or evade the necessity for defining matters hardly ripe for definition (as, for example, the exact limits of the power of the crown), which are best determined by practice and usage, I do not dispute; but it cannot, I think, be denied that neither a man nor a nation accustomed in the field of politics to reverence

formulas which are not even supposed to correspond with fact, can easily avoid a tendency to that confusion between words and things which in its fully developed form amounts to cant.

“Many of our men of speculation,” writes Burke, “instead of exploding general prejudices, employ their sagacity to discover the latent wisdom which prevails in them. If they find what they seek—and they seldom fail—they think it more wise to continue the prejudice, with the reason involved, than to cast aside the coat of prejudice, and leave nothing but the naked reason; because prejudice, with its reason, has a motive to give action to that reason, and an affection which will give it permanence. Prejudice is of ready application in the emergency; it previously engages the mind in a steady course of wisdom and virtue, and does not leave the man hesitating in the moment of decision, sceptical, puzzled, and unresolved. Prejudice renders a man's virtue his habit, and not a series of unconnected acts. Through just prejudice, his duty becomes a part of his nature.”

These sentences admirably describe the mode in which the influence of public life, or, in other words, English constitutionalism, has affected the tone of English speculation. As a satire on the errors of the French *philosophes*, in reference to the practical turn given by English thinkers even to their theoretical conclusions, the passage is as effective as any one of the reflections on the Revolution in France. But language meant by Burke as a eulogy of English political methods suggests to a modern reader some obvious reflections on the mode in which constitutionalism has not only affected, but distorted, English speculation. There never was a country where so much talent and ingenuity has been expended in defending what was rationally indefensible as in England. The practical evils of this tendency to find reasons in favor of prejudices must more than once have been keenly felt by Burke himself. His lifelong efforts to repeal the penal laws were all rendered abortive by that peculiarity of national sentiment which he held up for the admiration of his French correspondent. The ingenuity of Eldon, and of men like Eldon, defeated the genius of Burke. The penal laws against the Catholics, the disabilities of Dissenters, the brutality of the criminal law, the ruinous impolicy of the old poor-law, the glaring abuse of rotten boroughs, and a hundred other anomalies, which no man out of Bedlam would venture to defend, were all kept alive for at least half a century beyond the time when systematic thinkers had perceived that they ought to be abolished, because our men of speculation supplied arguments or fallacies for the use of the multitude, who, from the nature of things, must be men of prejudice.

But let no one fancy that the evil of subordinating even speculative conclusions to considerations of supposed practical utility ends with the support it gives to existing abuses. A far worse result is that this tendency affects the freedom of thought itself. There is assuredly no fault more often to be found in English thinkers than a want of intellectual disinterestedness. With one eye they search for truth, with the other eye they look to the supposed practical results of the truth which they are seeking to discover. Where your treasure is there will your heart be also, is true in other spheres than in that of religion. The thinker whose real concern is to find arguments in support of some practical conclusion will find them in plenty, but it is only a lucky accident if he finds out the truth. The error of transplanting into the realm of speculation the habits of compromise which are proper to the sphere of politics, of course most naturally flourishes in the province of political speculation. If any one wishes to measure the extent to which the want of intellectual disinterestedness may vitiate the conclusions even of the most honest speculative writers, let him study the works of W. R. Greg, and consider the extent to which that eminent

writer's theories are affected by his bias as a manufacturer; or let any one of my American readers take up any English work upon America and examine whether the whole tone of the writer, be he Liberal or Conservative, is not in reality tinged by the bearing or supposed bearing of American experience on English politics. Constitutionalism has, in fact, become part of the nature of Englishmen. We are constitutionalists even in our theories. We gain something in moderation, but we lose a good deal in force and in insight. We often lose also that directness of view and simplicity of statement which are the great safeguards against cant.

Constitutionalism, however, fosters cant in other modes besides its tendency to lead to confusion between words and things and to promote intellectual compromises. Our modern system of government rests upon a constant appeal by statesmen to public opinion. Our political leaders are compelled to be constantly speaking to the public. They are forced to defend their conduct without being able in most cases to give the true grounds for its justification. They are compelled to speak off-hand about matters on which they may be ill informed or may not have made up their minds. They are forced to deny the errors of their friends and to exaggerate the errors of their foes. Debate, moreover, in Parliament is not intended to produce conviction. Its true object (when its aim is not simply to waste time) is to stimulate the zeal of the speaker's friends and to discourage his opponents. Lord Abinger, in the singularly interesting fragment of autobiography which gives value to an otherwise worthless life, contrasts the reality of the forensic contests in which he excelled all advocates, past or present, with the artificiality of the parliamentary debates, in which he failed. As an advocate, he in effect urges, "I hoped to convince the jury that my client was in the right, and constantly succeeded in convincing them. As a parliamentary speaker, I neither hoped to change nor did change a single vote." It is a little odd to find Scarlett denouncing the shams and unreality of Parliament. It is scarcely more odd than to learn from Mr. Disraeli that invective is the ornament of debate. The great verdict-winner and the great rhetorician both knew what they were talking about, and for once spoke the truth. The vice of parliamentary debate is unreality, and unreality lies next door to cant.

If a thoughtful critic might with great probability conclude that the conditions or necessities of English public life would necessarily engender cant, events passing before our eyes would afford sufficient proof that this expectation is not belied by experience. In truth, I am inclined to think that in England the action of leading politicians is a good deal more honest than their language. Foreigners, indeed, believe that English policy is tortuous, far-sighted, and untrustworthy. But an impartial historian of the nineteenth century will, it may be suspected, find very little of deliberate craft and subtle policy in modern English statesmanship. Popular government has many defects, but it does not develop cunning. Certain permanent influences, such as the relation of England to India, the absolute necessity of maintaining our naval power, the need of freedom for our trade, the national impulse toward emigration, the belief, on the whole well founded, that England has but comparatively small interest in many of the questions which divide Continental states—these and several other considerations fix, as by a decree of Fate, the course of English policy. It is no accident that while we did not care to intervene in the Franco-German war, we sent an army to Abyssinia to dethrone King Theodore; it is owing to no freak of Mr. Gladstone's, or of Mr. Gladstone's opponents, that an English Ministry which ardently desired

peace and was sincerely opposed to all schemes for extending the Empire, has occupied, and may very possibly, in fact if not in name, annex, Egypt. The influences which direct the course of our foreign policy are permanent and intelligible enough. Unfortunately, it is hardly possible for English statesmen to make clear in their own minds, and still less to state in clear and honest language to others, the considerations by which their actions will ultimately be determined. Plain action is made to look dishonest by very unsatisfactory apologies; the whole attitude not only of the Government, but of the Liberal party, including the writers in the Liberal press, with regard to Egypt is a curious exemplification of this statement. That Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues have acted honestly and conscientiously I have myself not the remotest doubt. Any man not prepared to give the Khedive the armed support of England could no more have kept his place in an English Cabinet than could Mr. Bright. I have never met with any consistent opponent of English intervention in Egypt who was not, when hard driven, compelled to admit that he was opposed to the maintenance of the British Empire in India. Whether it is expedient, politic, or just for that Empire to be maintained, is a fair question of morals or of political theory. But it is a question which can no more be treated at present as open by an English Premier than it was possible for an American President to act twenty years ago on the conviction that the North ought to tolerate secession.

There is not the slightest ground, further, for supposing that Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Gladstone's supporters are prepared to break up the Empire. Against their action little can be said, except that their very just feeling against aggression, and their very natural feeling that there was an apparent incongruity between the tone taken by the Liberal leaders and party in 1880 and the attack on Alexandria, led them to delay action till nothing was possible but armed intervention. It is the language, or rather the tone, of leading Liberals which is open, if not to censure, yet certainly to observation. Conservatives are grossly unfair when they assert or imply that Mr. Gladstone's speeches in Midlothian pledged him to abstain on all occasions from foreign war. What, however, is in my judgment true is, that the tone taken not so much by Mr. Gladstone as by the whole Liberal party during the electoral campaign is hardly consistent with the tone they are forced to maintain with regard to the Egyptian campaign. It was quite right to denounce the faults, and I may add the dishonesty, of Lord Beaconsfield's policy of aggression; but there was little ultimate wisdom and some amount of intellectual confusion involved in the use of language which seemed to reprobate the policy not only of Beaconsfield, but of Palmerston. An evil result of this error is the constant use by apologists for the Ministry of very strange and unnatural apologies for very simple and, in my judgment, very defensible conduct. It is impossible to read a Liberal paper, or to listen to the speech of a Liberal M. P., without thinking how different would have been the language of the journal or the speaker if Lord Wolseley's triumphs had strengthened the Ministry not of Gladstone, but of Beaconsfield.

Another and even greater evil lies in the fact that a policy defended on non-natural grounds almost of necessity becomes of itself an ambiguous policy. But the last and worst result of the apparent inconsistency (for I think it is hardly more than apparent) between the rhetorical attacks which drove Lord Beaconsfield from office and the policy which events have forced on his successors is, that the electors throughout the country who were roused to action by an appeal to their moral feelings may think—wrongly

enough, but not unnaturally for half-educated men—that the moral indignation avowed by Liberal leaders against Lord Beaconsfield, which was assuredly perfectly sincere, was a mere rhetorical trick. I do not share Mr. Bright's religious principles, and I am not an ardent admirer of his statesmanship; but, under his peculiar circumstances, his dignified retirement from office was, I am convinced, as great a service as any he has ever rendered (and he has rendered great services) to his country. He was, what his colleagues were not, really pledged against that form of "defensive" warfare which consisted in the bombardment of Alexandria. He preserved the moral tone of public life by redeeming his pledge.

The debates on the "closure" remind us, if reminder were needed, that the causes which infect political life with cant do not produce their effect on one party in the state alone. The Conservative case against the Government was that Mr. Gladstone, by means of his rules of procedure, was destroying parliamentary liberty of speech. Assume that the charge was true, or even that the men who made it believed it to be true, and no denunciation of the conspiracy against the liberties of Englishmen could be too strong. As far as strong language went, the Tories seem indeed to have done their best or worst. If their scolding did not rise to the level of invective, the defect lay in want of capacity, not in want of will. But the strangeness of their conduct, supposing the Conservatives to have believed what they said, lay in the miserable feebleness and futility of their opposition to an act which on their view was one of monstrous tyranny. They made no fight, or only made just fight enough to show that their heart was not really engaged in the matter for which they were fighting. The Tories were, it will be said, in a minority; so were the Tories of 1882, and if any one wishes to see the difference between a sham and a real parliamentary battle, he should compare the languid defence of free speech by Sir Stafford Northcote with the dogged and desperate defence of "rotten boroughs" by Sir Robert Peel. What is the explanation of the difference? Are we to suppose that the Tories of to-day lack the spirit of their fathers? The supposition would do them gross injustice. The explanation is far simpler. The men of 1882 were in grim earnest; the Conservatives of 1882 were only trying hard to believe that they themselves were in earnest. That this is so may be proved by two considerations, which are simple but, to my mind, conclusive. If the Conservatives had really believed that limits placed on the abuse of speech would really suppress freedom of debate, they ought never to have assented (and in fairness to them I must add they never would have assented) to proposals which would have made it perfectly easy to silence the only unpopular minority in the House—namely, the Home Rulers. Every argument in favor of protecting a minority told with double its usual force in favor of securing that the Home Rulers should not be silenced. It is essential that Irish opinion should be heard in England; it is most desirable that Irish opinion should not only have free expression, but should be known to all the world to have free expression, in the English Parliament. To silence Irish members of Parliament may really prevent Englishmen from knowing the wishes of Ireland. Even to appear to silence the Home Rulers may at least appear like oppression to the Irish people. Yet the protectors of free speech and the guardians of the alleged rights of minorities were willing to let a two thirds majority—i. e., in effect a majority of Englishmen—silence the representatives of Ireland.

If, again, the Tories believed that the rules of procedure were fatal to the dignity and to the

liberty of the House of Commons, it was both their duty and their right to announce that whenever the Tories again commanded a majority in the House the rules would be repealed. These rules are not, be it remarked, like a statute: they can be altered by any party who have the command of the House. Yet the Tories gave neither sign nor pledge that their return to power would mean the restoration to the House of Commons of its lost liberties. They probably thought that authority which might be ill used by Mr. Gladstone would be very useful in the hands of Sir Stafford Northcote. But if the Tories thought this, or anything like it, they did not really believe that Mr. Gladstone was assailing liberty of speech. The rhetorical denunciations of a useful and necessary reform of procedure turn out, therefore, to have been only the latest specimen of political cant. D.

"LE ROI S'AMUSE" REVIVED.

PARIS, December 21, 1882.

THE representations of the "Roi s'amuse" have, on the whole, not been favorable to Victor Hugo. In vain was a great banquet held at the Continental Hotel, presided over by the great man himself, and his glory celebrated in a hundred speeches. In vain did M. Perrin, the director of the Théâtre-Français, and M. Got (*Triboulet*) speak on the occasion. Victor Hugo said very little: "I thank you all, all"—and that was all. He could hardly thank the public; for the public, which had received lately with so much favor "Hernani" and even "Ruy Blas," had decidedly not given its sovereign sanction to the "Roi s'amuse." Of course, it was tacitly agreed that no mark of disrespect should be shown to the old poet; but silence is not disrespect, and I have never seen a more silent, a colder audience than I saw lately at the Français. I do not speak only of the public of the *Tuesdays*—of that chosen public which is essentially difficult to please, which is reserved even in its moments of enthusiasm, and which is opposed in its politics to Victor Hugo; I speak of the ordinary public, of what may be called the railway public, the hundreds of people whom the railways bring every day to Paris from all parts of France and of the world. The truth must be told: there is not in the "Roi s'amuse" a single character which attracts the natural sympathy of a great audience; and, in the second place, the absurdity of the plot is too manifest. When you are reading the play quietly at your fireside, all the absurdities, the incongruities, taking no tangible or visible form, disappear in the charm of the poetry, like strange sounds in the harmony of a splendid orchestra. The lyrical part of the play is very fine, but, on the stage, you want something more. You can interest yourself in *Hernani*; you almost believe in the young lord who has become a bandit, and who is waging war against his King; you can even, though it is already more difficult, believe in *Ruy Blas*, who has made himself, in a moment of misery, a lackey, but who has the manners and the soul of a gentleman. It is impossible to believe in *Triboulet*, in the King's fool. *Triboulet* is made odious from the beginning: he connives at all the follies of the court and of his royal master; he holds the ladder when he thinks the noblemen are going to rob *M. de Cossé* of his wife, and to bring *Madame de Cossé* by force to the room of *Francis I.* He is quite as bad, quite as immoral, as all the gentlemen against whom he turns when he finds that they have robbed him of his own daughter. He is almost disgusting in the first act; we cannot much sympathize with him when he shows himself in the character of a father.

I have heard it said that the comparative

failure of the play is owing to the acting of Got, who took the part of *Triboulet*. "I have always thought," said M. Perrin to a friend, "that the part of *Triboulet* was a comical part: Got has persuaded me that it is a tragical part." So it is tragical; but it is tragedy without nobility, without any greatness. I cannot say that Got plays the part badly. He plays it very conscientiously, and it is not his fault if it is entirely out of harmony with the character of a buffoon. His long, eternal monologues are very tiresome on the stage, though they are full of magnificent poetry. Whenever he ought to act, he speaks—his indignation becomes too eloquent, his fury is lost in hexameters. When he has once undertaken to avenge himself and to have the King murdered by *Saltabadil*, he might become a little more concentrated. No, he still goes on; and when, finally, he thinks that he holds the corpse of the King of France, of *Francis I.*, in a bag which he himself will throw into the Seine, instead of accomplishing what he considers his mission, he begins the most interminable monologue. All this poetry out of place is exceedingly fatiguing, and *Triboulet* has been universally pronounced to be a complete failure in a dramatic sense.

Is there in the play some other character which might console the spectator? Alas! no. *Triboulet's* daughter, *Blanche*, is made very interesting—she is the angel of this hell; but the angels of Victor Hugo are sometimes very terrestrial. This innocent girl, brought up in seclusion, falls in love with a man whom she believes to be a young student. She is taken by force, brought to the Louvre by the courtiers, and recognizes her lover in the person of the King. At first she is indignant, she remonstrates; she runs away from him, and takes refuge—where? In the King's own room. And when, after a most distressing scene, during which *Triboulet* insults all the courtiers and screams for his daughter, she comes back, with her hair flowing and her white gown torn, to remain with her father and tell him her sad tale, and he resolves to take vengeance on the King, she implores her father for his sake: "Car je l'aime toujours!" I confess that this "Je l'aime toujours," after what has just happened, completely spoils *Blanche* for me. If she still loves the treacherous and brutal *Francis*, why should we be angry with him? This painful part of *Blanche* is extremely well rendered by Mlle. Bartet; she gives it a certain air of trouble, of confusion, of decency which is very praiseworthy. Her defects serve her as well as her qualities, for she is naturally weak and delicate, and very naturally enters into a part where she is quite sacrificed. The love which *Blanche* feels for the King is such that afterward, when she has witnessed his infidelity to herself and seen him making love to *Maguelonne*, the sister of the bandit *Saltabadil*, she resolves to sacrifice herself to him and become the voluntary victim of the brigand's poniard. It is extremely difficult to imagine self-sacrifice under such conditions. Why should *Blanche* give away her life in order to save the life of a man who has treated her as *Francis* did? She owes nothing to him, she ought to abhor him: she dies for him. Mlle. Bartet saves the painful absurdity of this situation a little by her delicate acting; she seems almost unconscious, like a poor victim following the dictates of destiny.

As for *Francis I.*, he is simply abominable from beginning to end. In the midst of his court, he appears like a drunken Faun; he smiles and laughs and shows his fine clothes. But all the costumes painted by Titian cannot give him the mien of the King who said on the evening of Pavia: "Tout est perdu, fors l'honneur." Mounet-Sully plays the part of

Francis I. He is an actor of great merit, but he is very *inégal*, as we say: he is either excellent or very bad. There is in him something which makes him particularly fit for excessive parts, full of extravagance, of violence, of folly. He is an admirable *Hernani*, as *Hernani* is at times a raving maniac and at times a crazy lover; he is excellent in some plays drawn from antiquity, like "Edipus," as there is in *Edipus* a certain sort of fatality, of folly. As *Francis I.*, as King of France, Mounet-Sully is a complete failure; he acts like a drunken maniac, and not like a young king. How different was Worms in the part of *Charles V.* in "Hernani." Full of pride, of dignity, even in his fits of rage and passion, he looks like a man superior to all men. Mounet-Sully is only tolerable in the "Roi s'amuse" when he comes in disguise, dressed as a young student, to the house where lives the daughter of *Triboulet*. In his love-scenes he is almost perfect, as he is handsome, has a touching, rich, and harmonious voice, and has a certain want of intellect—not to use a less polite expression—which is not disagreeable in a young lover. He does not appear as well, in the fourth act, when he comes to the house of the brigand *Saltabadil*, and drinks and jests with *Maguelonne*, the sister. Poor *Maguelonne*! she is one of our cleverest actresses—Mme. Samary, the niece of the Brohans, the child, so to speak, of the Théâtre-Français, a true Parisienne. Her last success was in the "Monde où l'on s'ennuie" of Pailleron, where she played the part of a spoiled and natural child in the midst of artificial people. As *Maguelonne* she seemed almost ashamed of herself; the part would have been much better played by a handsome, stupid, and brutish woman, such as can represent to us the accomplice of a brigand of the fifteenth century.

The dramas of Victor Hugo are essentially operatic; they call for what goes under the general name of *mise-en-scène*. They are made to touch our senses as well as our intellects and our hearts. It is curious to see how well Verdi was inspired by this operatic tendency in his "Rigoletto": he translated, so to speak, the "Roi s'amuse" into music, softened its defects, and gave it the ideality which belongs to music. If I had the choice between seeing the "Roi s'amuse" at the Français and hearing "Rigoletto," I should prefer the latter. The situations are the same, but the coarseness of the drama, the absurdities of it, disappear—the characters assume a certain vagueness. When you read the drama, the lyrical part of it completely absorbs the dramatic part; when you hear "Rigoletto," a similar effect is produced—a certain sense of unreality seizes you, and you are in a land of dreams, not at the court of a real prince, with a real jester and real courtiers. M. Perrin felt the necessity of treating the "Roi s'amuse" a little like an opera. During the whole of the first act, while the King enjoys himself with his friends, an invisible orchestra is heard. In the third act we have a song, "Quand Bourbon vit Marseilles," to a real guitar. In the great act on the banks of the Seine, we see Notre Dame across the river, the houses on the quay, and here and there a light in the windows. We have a real storm while the King is in the house of *Saltabadil*; it rains, we hear the rain falling; the wind blows as fiercely as it does in a tempest. We can do all these things now by means of electricity and machinery. This realism has been much blamed; I should blame it myself in a piece of Corneille's or of Racine's. I cannot blame it in a drama of Victor Hugo's, for Victor Hugo does not captivate my mind so much that I cannot enjoy a little the material part of the representation. He speaks not to those higher thoughts which dwell above all material things;

with him, love, ambition, anger, all human passions seem more human; he only lifts me high in order to drag me down again. We must take him as he is, and treat him accordingly. He writes *libretti*, not tragedies in the old sense of the word. He is a Romantic, not a Classic; he is a demigod, not a god.

Correspondence.

THE CIVIL SERVICE AND THE LOCAL BOSSES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: We are so agreeably surprised by the prompt passage of the Senate Civil-Service Bill by the House of Representatives, that it seems almost ungracious even to wish it were better; but the shout of rejoicing in country neighborhoods would have been louder could we have a more direct share in the advantages of the bill. The great bosses will be crippled, but in those States which contain no large cities bossism will remain about what it is now; and a rural boss is just as offensive in a small way as a metropolitan boss. What we need is, that official fingers be kept out of the elections. There should have been a section forbidding postmasters and other Federal officials to meddle with local party politics. Postmasters will still be appointed for their services to Senators and Congressmen, and still manage the country politics and preside over the district conventions.

Respectfully yours, C. G. HOWLAND.
LAWRENCE, KANSAS, Jan. 8, 1883.

THE SUPPRESSION OF "CORNERS."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: You seem to look with little favor or confidence on the movement to suppress "corners," and similar abuses of the Exchange, by act of the Legislature, and you feel inclined to scoff at the labors of the New York Senate Committee which is trying to learn wisdom from the kings of the Stock and Produce Exchanges. If the only object to be attained was the suppression of stock and produce gambling, you would undoubtedly be right: that can no more be suppressed by the power of the State than faro or keno—much less, indeed, for the "keepers" and "dealers" of the game at the Exchange are much richer and more influential than the men of the painted table or the "pegs," and proportionally more able to fight successfully the attempted enforcement of any law that might be levelled against them.

But a more modest end might be achieved. The courts of justice might be relieved of the ungrateful task of sitting as referees for gamblers. There should be an end to the disgraceful war of injunctions. The old English practice never allowed an arrest in an action for "goods bargained and sold," that is, in an action merely to enforce the fulfilment of a bad bargain. This is one good starting point. Let us allow no "provisional remedy" of any sort—injunction, attachment, etc.—in any suit growing out of options, selling short, future deliveries, etc. And, though contracts for the future delivery of produce may be, and often are, made for honest business purposes, those for the future delivery of stocks or bonds can never subserve any useful purpose, and should simply be ignored by the courts as null and void.

Generally, when a suit is brought for "differences," it is not brought by one better against the other, but by the broker who has made the outlays for the losing speculator—in good faith, of course; and it generally turns out that the

greater part of these outlays represents the broker's own commissions. It was decided, as long ago as in the days of Lord Mansfield, in the case of *Faikney vs. Reynous* (4 Burrows, 2069), that such suits can be maintained, though the original transaction, the losses in which had been settled, were tainted with "stock-jobbing," and themselves unlawful. It would not be difficult to frame a legislative act to reverse this line of decisions, and put the keepers of bucket shops, big as well as little, upon the same footing as the keepers of faro banks.

The time of the court ought to be occupied with more serious business than the settlement of losses on 'Change.

Respectfully,
L. N. D.

LOUISVILLE, KY., December 31, 1882.

SOUTHERN HOMICIDE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have read with much interest your editorials and the communications in your columns on "Homicide in the South." I write merely to correct a statement which, by an omission, doubtless without malice, does the South an injustice. The error is in the communication of your correspondent, "X. Y. Z." By the laws of Alabama (see section 358 of code) farming tools to the amount of twenty-five dollars to each head of a family are exempt from taxation, and so are the tools of a mechanic of a like value. We have many more pistols and dirks than we need, and I wish they were not used so frequently; but we also have a sufficiency of farming and mechanical tools, and the valuation quoted by "X. Y. Z." represents only the valuation subject to taxation, and this is, of course, undervaluation of the taxable portion.

WM. A. DAVIS.

EUFAULA, ALA., January 8, 1883.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Home truths are very often disagreeable. Indeed, we of the South are very sensitive about some home truths which come very close to us. But the only true way is to look things square in the face, and if those things are evil and hurtful to us, we should oppose and end them. Let me confess that your strictures in regard to Southern homicide are justifiable. You are sustained in what you say by facts. Murders are occurring every day, south of Mason's and Dixon's line, which prove your words true. Wherefore deny them? The public prints teem with them. No candid man will excuse them, because there is no excuse for them; and, indeed, some of the excuses put forth by your indignant Southern correspondents are as bad as the murders themselves. The only thing to do is to acknowledge the fact, recognize the evil, and seek a remedy.

In the first place, why is it that homicide is prevalent in the South? To answer this question it is not necessary to review the habits and temperaments of our ancestors. They have enough to answer for without saddling upon them this sin, which pertains peculiarly to our own day and generation. Homicide was not half so prevalent in the South fifty years ago as it is to-day. It is a growth of recent date, comparatively speaking. But whether it is of recent date or not, whether it is the outgrowth of immemorial custom or not, matters little in the face of the fact that it is an evil present with us, around us, and among us. Our criminal laws are not in fault; they are stringent enough. Our juries, and the men who execute our laws, are largely responsible for the condition of things existing in the South. A widespread and mistaken idea that a man must avenge an insult or a wrong by taking the law into his own hands, has taken a strong

hold upon the public mind; it has permeated to all classes and conditions of men. Why? Because the law is not properly executed, because at law men cannot obtain redress. Therefore, the men who execute the laws are largely and perhaps criminally responsible for the prevalence of the homicidal evil at the South.

Another reason is the habitual carrying of concealed weapons. The other day, at a trial before a justice of the peace, a witness testified that a man who was being tried for an assault was armed. The question was asked him, with what was he armed? He replied: "With the arms we all carry." "What are they?" "A pistol and a knife." When a witness in a court of justice can say with perfect coolness, and in a matter of fact tone, that he and all his neighbors habitually carry a pistol and a knife, and speak of it as nothing unusual or surprising, is it wonderful that murder should take place whenever two neighbors fall out about any matter of business or other thing? The people have become used to see murderers acquitted or lightly punished—so used to it, indeed, that they take it as a matter of course, and when men serve on juries who are in the habit of thinking about murder as not a very high crime, it is not surprising that they punish it lightly or not at all.

The remedy for the evil seems to me to be to discuss it freely and fearlessly as you have been doing. The people must be educated to think of murder as it really is. It must be robbed of its sentimental phases. Let it stand out before their eyes in its hideousness, and let them understand what a fearful crime it is. Let men of influence and standing among us boldly denounce it. Let us not undertake to justify it, for there is no justification possible. Let there be a reform in the execution of our laws. That reform will come; it may be slow, like all reforms, but it will be effective, and it will be realized. Let us hope that the seeds are already sown which will bring forth good fruit. I trust that the discussion going on in your columns will not end until the necessity for it ceases.—Very respectfully,

JAMES HAY.

MADISON C. H., VIRGINIA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The communication of "Old Subscriber" in your last issue (No. 915) determines me to do what I have been intending to do ever since you have been writing about "Southern homicides"—to testify, as a Southerner born and bred and an unrepentant "Rebel" of the bitterest sort, that you have written the truth, and only the truth, upon this subject, and to thank you for the entire absence of any malice or misrepresentation in your articles. I have just reread all these articles, with the replies of your correspondents and your own rejoinders, and confess that I am astonished at your fairness, calmness, and moderation. For ten years I have not missed reading a single number of the *Nation*; there is no consideration which could make me part with it. I have circulated it and extended its subscription among other ministers in a way I have never done for any religious journal. I now wish I could put a copy of it in the hands of every young Southerner of sufficient intelligence to appreciate it. It is with grief and mortification that I read the silly replies of some Southern newspapers to your articles—replies which in every instance confirmed your statements and inferences, for they proved that these editors were unaffected by and indifferent to the disgraceful events you were justly condemning. The daily in my own town made a characteristic reply, putting your articles in the category of Yankee "persistent and malicious misrepresentations"; yet the same issue published a news item of the kind described and

denounced; and in a day or two copied from a Georgia paper a communication of a column upon the pardon of the murderer Cox by Governor Stephens, in which Cox is made a hero of, the sympathies of the reader evidently appealed to in his behalf, and, to crown the whole infamous communication of an infamous transaction (Governor Stephens's pardon of him), the communication furthermore tells us that a son of Colonel Alston will probably feel called upon to avenge his father's death, now that his murderer is set free. Yet this daily paper of mine spoke no word of surprise or condemnation. As you have well said, this thing is a "damning spot" upon the character and name of the Southern people, and it is sadly corroborative of your position that the only papers which second your well meant attempts to make the Southern people ashamed of this barbarous sentiment are those which, like the *News and Courier* and *Courier-Journal*, are the least sectional.

Another striking confirmation of what you have written on this subject is the fact that the Southern religious press is as reticent on this subject as the Northern religious press was about the wickedness and rascalities which, during the carpet-bag régime, were perpetrated among us in the name and with the approval of the whole Northern people. There is to me an interesting analogy between the way in which the Southern religious press ignores the existence of this sentiment among us, when it is its duty to denounce and seek to destroy it, and the way in which the Northern religious press either hounded on the Republican party to its foul and cowardly oppression of the South, or held up to youthful admiration and consequent imitation the greatest rascals that party vomited out upon the country. It shows how greatly a social or moral distemper can affect every class and calling of a nation or community so as to poison the very sources from which recovery alone can come. It is also interesting to note that, just as religious liberty was among the religious themselves what Diderot defined it to be, "the liberty of persecuting other religions than one's own," and became established mainly through the instrumentality of such irreligious men as Voltaire and Jefferson, so the only honest indignation manifested anywhere North against the wickedness the "Great Moral Party" was perpetrating in the South, was shown by the *Nation*. The Northern religious press was out-Heroding Herod in its execrations of the South, and using all its tremendous influence among the masses to support the damnable measures of the Radicals in oppressing the South, long after the *Nation* had denounced them and warned the Northern people that such a disregard of the principles of republican government could not be confined to the Southern section of the Union, but that they were preparing the way for the same scenes to be repeated at the North by accustoming themselves to the sight of a party in power setting aside the safeguards of constitutional government for party purposes.

I have read the *Nation* with gratitude as a Southerner, and I may say almost with reverence, when it alone was lifting up its voice against the corruption and meanness of the Republican party in its infamous doings at the South, and against the dishonesty of both parties in deranging the national finances; I have seen the published number of its subscribers diminish by thousands in a year because of its adherence to truth and principle and its championing the cause of the South; I have seen it ever displaying an integrity no secular or religious journal North or South has displayed. Therefore, when these articles on homicide began to appear, though I at first resented them as an attack upon my country, yet my confidence in the *Nation* brought me to consider the matter in a light I had

not done before. I knew there was no sense in the *tu quoque* reply to the *Nation*, for no journal had ever been so outspoken in denouncing every form of social or political wrong-doing, North or South. I only wish I could send a copy of the *Nation* to every youth in our beloved South, that he might become educated out of his sectionalism into a broader and higher public sentiment.

A SOUTH CAROLINIAN.

JANUARY 13, 1883.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR : I see in the *Nashville American* a denial, signed "X. Q. Z.," of the habit of carrying arms in the South. Your article in answer is just. Young men are ready at any time, sudden and unexpected, for themselves or their friends, to go into a fight. I endorse you emphatically in what you say. Say it as often as you feel like it.

B. F. S.

HURRICANE, TENN., Jan. 6, 1883.

THE EVOLUTION OF REPUDIATION IN TENNESSEE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR : The Southern States especially, and the whole United States to a certain extent, are at this very moment mournful examples of the national corruption caused by familiarity with vice. The "spoils system," "political assessments," "machine politics," "influence," "the lobby," "jobs," "bossism," corruption in public and private life, breaches of confidence in the shape of defalcations, embezzlements, and misappropriation of trust funds, are all the progeny of an evolution of moral obliquity which has taken place so gradually that even observing men have scarcely noticed it. Now, at last, the public is awakening to find a state of things which seems unnatural and abnormal, as if some great moral cataclysm had suddenly wiped out of existence the race of good men, and introduced in its stead a new order of beings, between which and its predecessor there seems to be no connecting link.

The *Nation*, during several years and on many occasions, has sounded the note of warning and pointed out that *facilis est descensus*. No one of the evils above enumerated has escaped its argus eyes or been allowed to go unwhipped. But the warning of the watchman has been unheeded, or has been sneered at, as in the case of the "Southern homicides," which have been so truthfully and justly characterized as a blot upon the civilization of the people among whom they have occurred.

There is another form of moral degeneracy now threatening to sweep over the Southern States like a pestilence, against which every honest man ought to cry out in terms of uncompromising denunciation. At this very moment it is endangering the life of one of the largest and fairest and greatest of those States—Tennessee. When this moral disease affects the individual, and his neighbors suffer the loss of a few hundreds by his villany, it is called cheating, swindling, stealing, or some similar harsh term expressive of the most detestable conduct. But when a whole State, a great, sovereign body politic, is affected by it, and deliberately robs its creditors of millions of money, even the name *repudiation* is too harsh for the euphemistical orator of the political campaign; some less repulsive term must be found. In Louisiana it is called "scaling"; in Virginia, "readjusting"; and in Tennessee it rejoices in the high-sounding titles of "recognizing the equities," and "discrimination between the real and bonded debt of the State."

In whatever form it appears, and under whatsoever name known, it has been a disease of

slow but steady growth. The writer is a Southerner born and bred, and has always lived in the South, and therefore writes from a knowledge gained by long observation and experience. He became a citizen of Tennessee five years ago, from a more Southern State. At that time it would have been difficult to find a man of intelligence and respectability in Tennessee who would have acknowledged that he was a "debt-scaler," "readjuster," or "discriminator"; and perhaps not a single citizen of the State would have consented to be called a repudiationist. Nearly four years ago, what was known as the 50-4 scheme for settling the debt was submitted to the popular vote. A large majority of the voters would have nothing to do with it—stayed away from the polls altogether—and a great many looked upon it as an insult to the State to consider such a proposition as a question of State policy.

Somewhat over two years ago, Hawkins, Wright, and Wilson made the race for Governor, Wilson being a "low-taxer" (another euphemism for repudiationist). He received just votes enough to split the Democratic party and put Hawkins, a Republican, in the gubernatorial chair, although Tennessee was known to be a Democratic State by nearly 40,000 majority.

Meantime, during these various campaigns and canvasses, the politicians and demagogues were "instructing" the people. The 50-4 scheme had been advocated by many able and some good men. The good men spoke in favor of it because it was understood that the bondholders would accept it as a definitive settlement of the debt, and because it was considered of such great importance to get the debt settled in some way, and thereby eliminate it from State politics. These advocates used many specious arguments—arguments known by the makers of them to be fallacious. But they were cunningly and skillfully put before the people, and the people were thereby much "instructed," and acquired many new ideas.

Mr. Wilson, the "low-taxer," too, and his friends taught the people, from one end of the State to the other, the new doctrine of paying a big debt with a small sum of money, which Mr. Lincoln once said it was so hard for him to see how to accomplish. And, finally, in the last campaign between Hawkins and Bate (Fussell and Beaseley were really not in the race), the apostles of the new doctrine were the leading men of the State—and their name was legion—and they proclaimed it from the stump in every county and every neighborhood of the State: among the gorges and mountains of East Tennessee; on the plateaux and plains of Middle Tennessee, and in the lowlands and swamps of the Mississippi bottom; and their preaching was with power, and the whole people were awakened and converted. So that the very same doctrine which in 1878 had been treated with contempt, which in 1880 had caused the defeat of the "low-taxer" Wilson, in 1882 had become a mighty tide which, taken at the flood, carried General Bate to success.

And now, Tennessee, with her fine geographical position; with her great and varied natural resources; with her vast extent and wealth; with her unlimited potentialities for greatness and prosperity; with her beautiful scenery and proud past history, is cursed with the dry-rot of repudiation, which is already slowly, yet surely, and soon will be swiftly, sapping the foundations of her social, moral, political, and material well-being. Now even the best of her citizens do not hesitate to advocate the 50-3 scheme for settling the debt. They advocate this scheme only in case the bondholders are humble and tractable, and indicate the utmost willingness to accept it. If the bondholders are not thus disposed,

"straight-out and complete repudiation" is almost universally threatened.

The reasons given by good men in justification of their repudiation principles are curious and interesting, as indicating how completely false views may take possession of a people when they are assiduously cultivated by designing demagogues. The seeds of corruption are skillfully disseminated; they then germinate, grow, and fructify so stealthily that even the best of men are often unaware that the clearness of their moral sight has become darkened by a crop of noxious weeds.

Some of the principal reasons given are as follows:

The bonded indebtedness of the State was contracted during the reconstruction period, when a majority of her citizens were disfranchised. They had no voice in the matter, and are therefore not responsible for it.

The bonds were issued for the benefit of the railroads of the State; therefore, let them settle with the bondholders.

The bonds were sold at prices ranging from much below 50 cents on the dollar to not much above that figure. Fifty cents is probably above the average cost of the bonds to the holders. Hence they ought to be satisfied to get that for them.

The bondholders are rich, and can afford to take 50 cents and 3 per cent. interest, while the people are poor and cannot afford to be taxed to pay more.

The bondholders themselves have consented to have the bonds scaled to 60-3-4-5 and 6, and once you begin to scale there is no moral difference whether you scale much or little. Therefore we will scale as much as we please.

Finally, in the last campaign, 50-3 was the broadest plank in the platform, and, standing on it, General Bate was overwhelmingly elected to the Governorship. Hence the people have spoken plainly in favor of 50-3, and *Vox populi vox Dei* is a fundamental principle of a republican form of government.

All of these reasons are considered incontrovertible.

In conclusion, let me say that it is melancholy to note some of the immediate results of the moral obliquity which has grown upon our people. What the ultimate consequences will surely be it is fearful to contemplate. Even now individuals are tainted and contaminated by it. In their public and private relationships men are losing that keen sense of honor and honesty which should always characterize an upright people. The lamentable defalcation of the State Treasurer of Tennessee, which has just brought shame and disgrace upon a name of which every Tennessean has been so proud, is but a natural sequence to years of dallying with repudiation principles. These same principles, if they fasten themselves upon the people of the State, will destroy confidence, breed distrust, and upset all business relations. It is fearful to think how near we now are to the realization of these awful consequences. To be convinced that this is so, one needs but listen to conversations he can hear on the street corners, in the market-place, in the post-office, or anywhere where men gather together and discuss current events. The writer heard a business man of good standing in the community in which he lives remark, when the State Treasurer's crime was under discussion, "Oh! he is not to be blamed: a grab game is going on everywhere now; he had his chance and took advantage of it, and he did right." *O tempora, O mores!* +++

TENNESSEE, Jan. 9, 1883.

[It has taken about forty years to make "repudiation," itself originally a euphemistic

term for fraudulent bankruptcy, cacophemistic. Mississippi invented it, and Pennsylvania quickly adopted it. The dictionary-makers should not overlook this "rogue's progress" of the Queen's English.—ED. NATION.]

THE "NATURAL METHOD" OF TEACHING LATIN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Although I doubt whether you would be willing to open the columns of your paper to a discussion of the various methods of teaching languages, I venture to ask for the necessary space for the following remarks, suggested by the correspondence in No. 913.

One of the greatest difficulties the followers of the "natural method" encounter is no doubt the explanation of the meaning of new words to the pupils without the use of English, and from what I have seen, heard, and read of the various practical methods, of older and more recent date, I have not been able to satisfy myself fully on this point. Now, your correspondent says (p. 552): "The meaning of new words is explained to them [a class of beginners] in Latin, by their derivation, or by synonyms, or opposites, or by explanations, so that the student is compelled to think in Latin." One or two illustrations of this method would be of such interest to me, and I know to many teachers besides myself, that I beg to ask for the explanation, according to the above method, *e. g.*, of the words italicized in these sentences from the first and second chapters of Caesar's 'De Bello Gallico': "Belga: ab extremis Galliae finibus oriuntur," "Id hoc facilius eis persuasit, quod," etc. "His rebus fiebat, ut et minus late vagarentur," etc.

These examples are chosen at random, but they will answer the purpose as well as any. I confess I do not see any way of making the meaning of such words clear to beginners except by means of their English equivalents; therefore, I appeal to the advocates of a method which, it seems to me, has its serious drawbacks. The wonderful successes of men like Jacotot and Hamilton, and of other famous teachers before and after their time, as well as the unusual progress in linguistic studies of pupils like Montequieu and Macaulay, are among the most interesting facts in the history of education; yet they are easily explained by circumstances not surrounding those for whose benefit they are so often cited.

I thoroughly believe in making the study of languages as practical as possible, and I do not say that the method spoken of by your correspondent is not a good one; but it seems very doubtful to me whether there is any need of a revolution in methods—whether the trouble does not rather lie in the faulty use of methods now in vogue, and in the inability of many teachers to give to their instruction that practical turn which presupposes a mastery of the foreign tongue on the part of the teacher. A so-called conversation-method in the hands of a teacher not well versed in the language would certainly lead to pitiful results.

I know of a class of adult beginners in German who met last summer for five weeks, and during that time read intelligently one act of a play in prose, and the first three books of Goethe's 'Hermann und Dorothea.' Of course, they had to study the grammar in connection with their reading lessons, or they could not have done the work. English was spoken in the class-room when a principle covering perhaps hundreds of cases could be explained in a minute, while an attempt to explain the same in German would probably have been entirely unsuccessful. German was spoken to a considerable extent. It is true, nei-

ther teacher nor students could boast of having spoken "no word of English in the class-room"; but what would that amount to in comparison with the scholarly knowledge actually gained by the class in so short a time?

There are so many opponents of, or lukewarm believers in, the study of the ancient languages to be found in the ranks of those who have once themselves been classical students, that it is evident they did not acquire a sufficiently thorough and extensive knowledge of Latin and Greek to "see the use of it." The more students are drawn into the classical studies without a reasonable prospect of their pursuing them long enough to derive real benefit and enjoyment from them, the more opposition to such studies there will be in the future. "Easy methods" may at first be enticing to many, but most of them will prove disappointing. "In colonial days, a boy, to be admitted to Harvard, had to be able to read Cicero and Tacitus at sight, and to speak the Latin language readily and correctly." Would it not be well, in order to avoid all suspicion of empiricism, to examine carefully into the methods by which, in former times, results were reached, and in other places are now reached, that would satisfy the most ambitious?

Very respectfully,

A. LODGMAN.

YPSILANTI, MICH., Jan. 2, 1883.

A PROTEST.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will you permit me to inveigh in the strongest possible terms against the practice of the proprietors of *Littell's Living Age*? Without consent or any knowledge of mine, my last novel 'Robin,' although purchased from me for publication in the United States by Mr. Holt, of New York, was republished from *Temple Bar* by them and put through their magazine, added to which I find in their arrangements for 1883 my name advertised among their list of contributors.

As I have always received honorable treatment hitherto at the hands of American publishers, I think in fairness to those who pay, authors should protest against those who steal.—I am, sir, yours obediently,

LOUISA PARR.

18 UPPER PHILLIMORE PLACE, KENSINGTON, W.,
January 2, 1883.

Notes.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & Co. will be the American publishers of the 'Life of Sir William Rowan Hamilton,' by Robert Perceval Graves, of which the first volume has already been issued from the Dublin University Press.

'The Jews of Barnow,' stories by Karl Emil Franzos; 'Mrs. Lorimer, a Sketch in Black and White,' by Lucas Malet; and a new edition of 'The Virginia Comedians, or, Old Days in the Old Dominion,' by John Esten Cooke, will be published during the present month by D. Appleton & Co.

We are glad to learn that a second edition of Professor Harrison's 'French Syntax' will shortly be published by John E. Potter & Co., Philadelphia. Several important additions have been made to it, and notably a copious series of exercises.

Ten Brink's 'Early English Literature' (to Wychli) has been translated by Prof. H. M. Kennedy, and will be published immediately by Henry Holt & Co. The same firm will also bring out at once 'Lyrical and Dramatic Poems,' by Robert Browning, selected and edited by Edward T. Mason.

T. Whittaker will issue immediately the Bohlen lectures for 1882, delivered by the Bishop of Michigan, Dr. Harris, on the "Relation of Christianity to Civil Authority." The same

publisher has in preparation 'Principles of Agnosticism applied to Evidences of Christianity,' by the Rev. J. Andrews Harris, D.D., of Philadelphia.

The English critics have fulfilled our prediction of the praise they were likely to bestow on the illustrations of *Harper's Christmas*, and the English public have responded by exhausting the edition for that country in a single day.

The most attractive exhibition catalogue yet produced in this country, so far as our recollection serves, is that of the First Annual Exhibition of the Philadelphia Society of Etchers. For some reason that city has taken the lead in organizing its etching talent, and is now enjoying a fine array of 1,070 etchings—not all produced by Philadelphians, of course, nor by Americans, but each from the designer's own hand ("painters' etchings"). Mr. S. R. Koehler supplies an introduction largely given up to practical directions for the art. Interspersed are eight of the American etchings, two of which have a special interest—Mr. Stephen J. Ferris's "Fortuney Dead," and Mr. Joseph Pennell's "Café des Exilés"; the last being one of six illustrating Mr. G. W. Cable's stories.

The new Harvard Catalogue (C. W. Sever) shows a remarkable uniformity in the numerical strength of the undergraduate classes, the Freshmen leading off, of course, with 263, and the Seniors, Juniors, and Sophomores numbering 203, 209, and 208, respectively. While there are 229 medical students, there are but 134 law and 27 divinity students.

The Rev. Sheldon Jackson's paper on "The Neglect of Education in Alaska," with its map and many woodcuts, is the most noticeable feature of the Bureau of Education's Circular of Information No. 2, just issued, containing the proceedings of the department of superintendence at the National Educational Association in Washington last March. The accompanying circular and tracts on the University of Bonn, National Pedagogic Congress of Spain, and High Schools for Girls in Sweden seem to us outside the proper scope of the Bureau, and of doubtful utility.

We notice that the Principal of the Lasell Seminary at Auburndale, Mass., has provided a course of four lectures for the young ladies of that institution, on the "Principles of the Common Law," to be delivered next month by Mr. Alfred Hemenway, of Boston. "The legal rights and independence lately given to women," says the announcement circular, "bring responsibilities for which there has often been no corresponding preparation."

The thirteenth volume of Transactions of the American Philological Association for the year 1882 has appeared (Cambridge). Of the papers printed in full, perhaps the one possessing most general interest is that by Dr. Isaac H. Hall, on the Greek New Testament, as published in America. Dr. Hall thinks the earliest Greek book printed in this country was Mathew Carey's edition of the 'Enchiridion' of Epictetus (1792). The first Greek Testament came from the press of Isaiah Thomas in Worcester, Mass. (1800). Seven editions (following three foreign originals) served for the next twenty years. From 1821 on, each year has seen at least one (and often many), except the years 1824, 1828, 1830, 1836, 1839, 1843, 1867, 1874.

The two volumes, 1881-82, of the Providence Library's *Monthly Reference Lists*, most tastefully bound, like those before us, are a welcome addition to the endless variety of indexes. They can be used in connection with any good public or private library. We would suggest to Mr. Foster that by italicizing in his next volume-index the current topics, the page would exhibit at a glance the characteristics of the year.

Governor Begole, of Michigan, though making a clean sweep in other offices, has sensibly resisted the pressure on him for the removal of Mrs. Tenney, the excellent State Librarian (see *Nation*, vol. xxxv., p. 487). She was renominated, and promptly confirmed by the Senate. The State Library is safe now for two years.

Mr. Goldwin Smith's *Bystander*, revived as a quarterly (Toronto: Hunter, Rose & Co.), is a politico-literary review perhaps unique as the work of one hand. Its main object is to advocate what the editor considers the true interest of Canada—to develop and form relations, commercial and political, in accordance with and not in hostility to continental forces, as opposed to imperial ties and traditions. The large part, therefore, of his review which is devoted to Canadian politics is profitable reading for Americans, as of course are Mr. Smith's excursions when crossing the borders and commenting on the November elections and the defeat of woman suffrage in Nebraska. Mr. Smith's antipathy to the Jews crops out in treating of the settlement of Manitoba, while his pronounced Irish views are substantially reproduced from his recent article in the *Princeton Review*. Agnosticism continues to fill him with lively apprehension, and the revival of Mr. George Brown's shade in Mackenzie's 'Life and Speeches' justifies a renewal of plain-speaking concerning Mr. Smith's unscrupulous opponent. There is no one who cannot derive some instruction and entertainment from this characteristic *causerie*, of which the English style is almost a sufficient recompense.

Pach Bros., No. 841 Broadway, have made an excellent and very interesting photograph from life of Lieut. John W. Danenhower. The brave and unfortunate explorer wears his arctic costume, and the photographer's skill has furnished an appropriate background.

In *Le Français* for January 5 (Cambridge, Mass.), Mr. Jules Lévy makes a pleasant diversion in his editing by reprinting M. R. de Grilleau's timely article on "La France au Niger," to which a chart gives clearness. France and England in Madagascar, on the other hand, is the subject of a leading article in the *Nuova Antologia* for December 15, 1882 (New York: Christern). The author is A. Bruniati.

With the beginning of the new year, the *Athenæum Belge* turns monthly from the weekly that it has heretofore been. It is an excellent periodical, and would that there were more of it in quantity, as we presume would be the case if it had more support. A leading feature is the summary of the contents of periodicals, both Belgian and foreign.

More new periodicals call for mention: (1) *Museo Italiano di Antichità Classiche*, to be published at Florence, and edited by Comparetti, author of the 'Researches respecting the Book of Sindibād' published by the Folk-Lore Society; and (2) *Deutsche Hochschule*, a weekly "organ of German students," to be published at Prague, as an offset to the division of the University into two, German and Czech, at Prague, "that ancient nursery of German science, that fortress, now menaced, of German culture." It undertakes "to defend with all the fire of university inspiration, with juvenile intrepidity, both the character of the German university at Prague and *akademisches Deutschthum* in general." Besides treating university subjects, it will have amusing articles, humorous feuilletons, and scientific essays. We fear that though its "juvenile intrepidity" may be occasionally amusing, it will be found, on the whole, like most university magazines, rather dull reading for the outside world.

The tenth edition of Berghaus's "Chart of the World" has been received by Westermann &

Co. It is in eight sheets, arranged for mounting as one whole. The particularity of its annual revision extends even to definition of the arctic ice barriers, and in other respects it delineates all the new commercial routes by sea and land, the new telegraphic cables, the significant railway extensions, and presents the customary information concerning the physical features of the continents, the ocean currents, etc., etc. The Suez Canal, the Panama, Darien, Honduras, and Nicaragua routes, the Straits of Dover and of Sunda, the chief ports of the world, and so forth, are represented in numerous side-maps. The execution of this chart is characteristic of the house of Perthes at Gotha. The nomenclature is prevailingly English, but a glossary accompanies the map and gives the German equivalents.

Victor von Scheffel's 'Trompeter von Säckingen' has just reached its 100th edition (Stuttgart: Bonz & Co.).

It is becoming the fashion for German professors nowadays to write novels. Ebers's success every one knows. Professor Johann Scherr, whose history of English literature has lately been translated into our language, has just brought all the German critics about his ears by a novel in Rabelaisian style, 'Porkelès und Porkelessa: eine böse Geschichte.' The story is simply that of an adventurer who introduces himself into a Jewish family, and, with the assistance of a female Nihilist, of toxicological accomplishments, makes way with the whole family and enjoys their fortune. But the story is nothing; the satire, of the crudest sort and expressed in the most cynical manner, is everything. All the world is attacked—Wagner, Skobeleff, Stöcker, Auerbach, Sacher-Masoch, Treitschke—with a monotony of disapproval. Spielhagen will not find in Professor Scherr a proof of his theory of the superiority of German fiction.

The French have never been as fond of foreign fiction as the Americans or the Germans, but the chief series of exotic stories, the "Library of the Best Foreign Novels" (Bibliothèque des meilleurs Romans étrangers—Paris: Hachette; New York: F. W. Christern) now contains about three hundred volumes. As might be expected, the English novels freely permitted to that mysterious entity, the French *jeune fille*, are the most abundant of these translations. There are thirty-eight volumes of Miss Braddon, twenty-seven of Lord Lytton, twenty-nine of Dickens, seven of Mrs. Gaskell, nine of Thackeray, and sixteen of Wilkie Collins. The American contingent is sixteen volumes by seven authors, including Hawthorne, Longfellow, and Mrs. "Beecher-Stowe." There are only two volumes by Anthony Trollope, although there are three by his mother, one of which, however, is credited to him, and another is treated as anonymous.

Several years ago the *Nation* commented on the handsome volume of puppet-plays written by M. Lemercier de Neuville for his own Aristophanic *pupazzi*, as he chose to call the tiny comedians he handled in so skilful and amusing a manner. These earlier plays were full of "local hits," and were aimed at old heads. He has now prepared a little volume of slighter pieces intended to be acted by children and before children. Some of them are in prose, and some in the rhymed Alexandrines of French comedy. All are bright and excellently suited to their purpose. Especially to be commended in this volume, 'Les Pupazzi de l'Enfance' (Paris: Dolagrave; New York: F. W. Christern) is the appendix giving an illustrated and detailed description of the internal mechanism of the puppet show, and of the ingenious devices by which M. Lemercier de Neuville has im-

proved it. The plays are adorned with many sketches by M. B. de Monvel.

Some Assyrian antiquities brought from Mosul by Father Rylo, S.J., and given by him to the Vatican Library, which have remained forgotten there for thirty years, have just been brought to light again. Among them are inscriptions in the Hittite character, and it is hoped that some bilingual inscriptions, or at least fragments, may be found to give a clew to the lost language and throw some light upon the obscure history of early Syria.

—A considerable sum, exceeding £7,000, has been contributed by the friends and admirers of the late Francis M. Balfour to found at Cambridge, England, a scholarship in biology which should bear his name. The English committee, while they do not seek contributions in this country, yet hope that this memorial in honor of the most distinguished embryologist of Great Britain may excite some interest among the naturalists of the United States. An American committee, representing our principal colleges, has been formed, and it is hoped that the naturalists who knew Balfour only from his published works will join his personal friends in this testimonial to his rare personal character and brilliant intellectual powers. Prof. H. Newell Martin, of the Johns Hopkins University, has consented to act as secretary and treasurer of the committee.

—With a wise liberality, but without ostentation or extravagance, the city authorities of Boston have printed a new edition of the Proceedings at the rededication of the Old State House last July. Mr. W. H. Whitmore's capital address, curtailed in the delivery, is given at still greater length than in the pamphlet published immediately after the event, with revisions and additions, principally in the shape of notes and appendices. The public, to whom has unexpectedly been confided as a municipal monument a building second to no other in the country in historic importance and in preservation, needed not only the antiquarian's narrative of its vicissitudes, but the completest possible series of views showing the external changes which it has undergone since the present walls were erected in 1713. These have been inserted in the new volume, and will greatly help to stimulate popular interest in the cradle of Independence. The earliest view dates back to 1770, forming the background to the Boston Massacre as delineated in Paul Revere's contemporary engraving. Thanks to the intelligent restoration made under the auspices of the Bostonian Society, so much of the eastern front as is visible in Revere's print is identical with the corresponding portion of the actual front (as shown in the frontispiece), except that the sun-dial has not been put back in place of the clock. The next view is in 1785, and from that time nearly every decade is illustrated. Two views of Faneuil Hall, in demonstration of the much greater changes which have transformed that more modern but more famous edifice; views of other city halls than the Old State House; the city architect's plan of the second floor of the latter; and portraits of James Otis, Samuel Adams, Edmund Quincy, jr., John Hancock, Thomas Cushing, and James Bowdoin, still further anticipate the inquiries of a generation not too much addicted to historical research. In short, a more creditable American "city document" can hardly be named, and yet it has been assailed as a "job" and an "abuse" by a local newspaper which of all others is supposed to represent the blue blood and civic pride of Boston. Happily, the *Advertiser* includes in its condemnation the disinterested publications of

the Record Commissioners, and thus betrays its animus too unmistakably to deceive anybody.

—The Cincinnati Public Library has abandoned its project of publishing the catalogue of its library in separate classes, and will now print immediately a catalogue of the whole library with short titles, after the manner of the Poole catalogue of 1871. The subject-lists already printed embrace the English, German, and French fiction (1876), and drama (1878), all of which are meritorious works, and the fiction-lists rank with the best. The fact is, that the library, although it is constructing a card catalogue, has no catalogue accessible to the public of the books obtained between 1871 and 1877, except the above and a few printed medical titles. The monthly bulletins began to be issued in 1877. For the period between '71 and '77 an applicant for a book must ask without knowing whether the library has it, and an attendant on the galleries makes a search with no assistance except her or his knowledge of the classes in the alcoves. This, of course, made delays and complaints unavoidable; and as no room has been provided for the card catalogue, the only resource, and a highly useful one, has been to print a new catalogue of the whole library. The monthly bulletins, which are continued, will henceforth enable the public to keep informed as to the library's accessions. It is curious to note that this library, with many others in the country, suffered in the last year (ending with June) a decrease of circulation—a loss of 55,453 in the use of books, and of 73,466 in periodicals. The greatest loss was in fiction, 40,618 less volumes having been circulated. The librarian, Mr. Merrill, assigns good times and the multiplication of cheap editions of popular books as, in part, the reason of this falling off, and partly local causes, such as the great heat of the summer of '81, which caused the library hours to be shortened, a smallpox excitement in the winter of '80-'81, and the closing of the Cumminsville branch of the library, through an unfortunate mistake of the Board of Education. The Columbia branch of the library still remains open.

—Among the recent bulletins issued by the Census Office, one of the most interesting and important is that relating to the illiteracy of the population. It gives the number in each State, of ten years of age and above, who cannot read and who cannot write. The latter class is also divided into "native whites," "foreign whites," and colored. In the whole country, out of a total population above ten years of age of 36,761,607, 4,923,431 were returned as unable to read and 6,239,958 as unable to write. The former is 13.4 per cent., the latter 17 per cent., which, contrasted with 16 and 20 per cent. (the proportions of the corresponding classes in 1870), shows a very decided gain in the direction of, at least, the rudiments of education. Of the whites above ten years of age, the "cannot writes" formed 9.4 per cent. The native whites, however, show a proportion of but 8.7 per cent., while foreign whites show 12 per cent. A very large proportion of the illiteracy of the country, and especially of the South, is seen to be among the colored population, where the "cannot writes" form 70 per cent. of all above ten years of age. The distribution of the illiterates is a very interesting question. Plotting the percentages of the "cannot reads" upon a map of the United States, one prominent fact which stands out in bold relief is, that most of the illiteracy of the country exists south of Mason and Dixon's line, the Ohio, and the south boundary of Missouri. North of it are New Jersey, with 4.5 per cent.; Pennsylvania, 4.6; Ohio, 3.6; Indiana, 4.8; Illinois, 4.3; Missouri, 8.9; and

Kansas, 3.6. South of it are Delaware, 15.8; Maryland, 16; Virginia, 34; West Virginia, 12.1; Kentucky, 22.2; and Arkansas, 28.8. Further south the matter grows yet more serious, the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana ranging between 40 and 50 per cent. This is in great part due, of course, to the large proportion of the colored element; but, eliminating this, we still find a very marked difference upon the two sides of the line above traced. The white "cannot writes" north of this line range from 4.9 per cent. in Ohio to 10.5 per cent. in Missouri, while, bordering this line on the South, the percentages range from 8.1 in Maryland to 25 in Arkansas. The average of the States north of this line is between 5 and 6 per cent., while that of the southern group is between 17 and 18 per cent.

—Regarding the number of "cannot reads" as furnishing the measure of education in the community, Iowa is the "lanner State," having out of its total population but 2.4 per cent. of illiterates. Then follows Nebraska, with but 2.5 per cent.; and Wyoming, with 2.6. The Northeastern States, including New England, on the whole, fall behind the Northern Central States, probably because of the large manufacturing interests, which have drawn to them the Irish, French Canadian, and similar classes of immigrants, while the German and Scandinavian elements, particularly the better portions of them, have gone to the Northern Central section. Turning to the other extreme, the greatest proportion of illiterates is found in South Carolina, where nearly one-half the population over ten years of age (48.2 per cent.) cannot read. Louisiana follows close behind, with 45.8 per cent.; Alabama, with 43.5; and Georgia, with 42.8 per cent. Considering the whites alone of this group of States, however, North Carolina is found to have the largest proportion, with Tennessee occupying the second rank, probably in virtue of their mountain population, which is proverbially ignorant. In the Western States and Territories the conditions are very diversified. In the greater part of this section the proportion of illiterates is low; California, with 7.1, and Nevada, with 7.3 per cent., having, with two exceptions, the highest. Arizona has 16.7 per cent., and New Mexico, 60.2. In these Territories, and especially the latter, a large proportion of the population is of Mexican descent, which is well known to be extremely ignorant. Moreover, a large number of Pueblo and Moquis Indians are here included in the population, in accordance with the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

—A comparison of these figures with corresponding ones from the Ninth Census makes a gratifying exhibit of our educational progress, at least as far as the rudiments are concerned. In the country at large, the percentage of the "cannot reads" has fallen from 16 to 13.4 per cent. This gain, too, has been widespread, only Maine, New Hampshire, California, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Utah, and Montana showing a retrogression in this regard, while in many of the States the progress has been very great. These cases of retrogression have been apparent only, having been produced by a change in the population rather than by a decrease of education. In Maine and New Hampshire the influx of factory operatives, chiefly Irish and French Canadians, has lowered the average. In the Pacific States the Chinese have enacted the same rôle, assisted, to a considerable extent, by the importation of German and Welsh miners. The greatest steps toward a decrease of illiteracy, aside from one or two of the Territories where immigration from the East has been going on rapidly, have been taken in the South. Florida has decreased her percentage of illiteracy from

51 to 38; Mississippi, from 50 to 41.9; Georgia, from 50 to 42.8; Virginia, from 44 to 34; and Texas, from 33 to 24.1. In the first and last of these States much of the change is unquestionably due to immigration; still, it is to be borne in mind that nearly all the immigration to these States comes from other Southern States, and is not of a character to affect the average very markedly.

—"J." writes us from Cincinnati:

"I do not think that a child of the present generation, when his curiosity is aroused by the graceful youth who, in Raphael's 'Marriage of the Virgin,' breaks a stick across his knee," receives the same explanation of the act that was given to 'D.' of Menlo Park, fifty years ago. Now the child is bid to notice that St. Joseph there, as in many other pictures, carries a rod (stick) which has blossomed into lilies, and he is told the legend of how the Virgin, by her beauty and sweetness, won to herself many suitors besides the aged Joseph. The High Priest, unable to decide between their claims, bids them, after the manner of Aaron and the rebellious princes of Israel, lay up each his rod in the Temple; and, lo! the next morning, Joseph's rod, like Aaron's, had blossomed, and the miracle was received as a token that the Lord had chosen him to become the Virgin's husband. The graceful youth is one of the rejected suitors, and in despite breaks the rod which has done him such ill service. Such, at least, is the explanation given by Mrs. Jameson, in her 'Legends of the Madonna.'

Likewise, as another correspondent reminds us, Muntz, the latest biographer of Raphael, describes Joseph's rivals in this picture as "manifestant leur dépit en brisant la baguette qui n'a point porté de fleurs" (p. 84).

—M. César Daly, in a late number of his *Revue Générale d'Architecture*, has advanced an interesting theory on the origin of the arch and vault and their introduction into Egyptian architecture. Like all modern theories, it is evolutionary—that is, it proceeds on the supposition that each new phenomenon resembles its predecessor in the main, that it differs in only a few particulars, and that the differences are the result of changed circumstances. When the early Egyptian, ten thousand years ago, wanted a more permanent habitation than the tent that had sheltered his wandering ancestors, he found at his command three substances: mud, reed, stone. With the last the kings and priests, who had great forces at their service, built pyramids and temples, and rich men constructed their dwellings in cities. But before that pitch of civilization there must have been a style of building which has continued by the side of the other in the dwellings of the fellahin down to this day, in which the first two materials are used together. A square hole dug in the ground is surmounted by four walls of mud and reeds, and a roof of cane covered by branches and grass, which is all that is needed in a rainless country. This is the simplest method that has survived to this day. But M. Daly, with the eye of theory, looks back into what may be called a pre-antiquarian time, and sees there a missing link. There must have been, he thinks, a construction with the first material alone. The peasant formed a heap of sand as large as he wished his hut to be, threw over it a layer of tenacious Nile mud, and, when the mud was dry, pulled out the sand through an opening which became his doorway. Here was the first dome. If he wanted a large hut, as the mud dome was not strong enough to be made of very great diameter, he made it oblong; the larger the hut wanted, the longer it became: here was the vault. When unbaked bricks were discovered, the vault was made of them, and in this form it is still to be seen in any Egyptian village; but the moulded house has centuries since gone out of use. The dome, the vault, and the arch (for the doorway was an arch) thus discovered at

the very outset of building, instead of being, as has often been thought, the result of late conscious architectural thought, were used very sparingly in the stone architecture of the Egyptians. The priests avoided the arch in the temples, the rich used it rarely in their dwellings. It was left for the hut, the storehouse, and the tomb. For some reason or other the Egyptian regarded it with a distinct æsthetic aversion. The origin of this aversion M. Daly promises to discuss on some future occasion.

—A few months ago, we noticed the first volume of the 'Verfassung und Verwaltung des römischen Staates' of the veteran Danish scholar, J. N. Madvig. The second volume, completing the work, has made its appearance—not so speedily as was promised, nevertheless with remarkable promptness, in view of our usual experience in the continued works of German scholars. It consists of six chapters: "Die Theile des Reichs," "Das Rechtswesen," "Das Staatshaushalt," "Kriegswesen," "Gottesverehrung," and "Verschiedene Einrichtungen zum Besten des Staates und der Bürger," such as Education, Post, Hygiene, etc. The first volume was devoted to *Verfassung* (Constitution), this to *Verwaltung* (Administration). It will be seen that it embraces topics on which we are at present lamentably deficient in books of reference—the administration of justice, for example. Until we have some complete and scholarly work in English (of which we see no prospect), this will probably be found the best work for that large class of American students who, being sufficiently familiar with the German language, but not having either the time or the means, or the special training to make use of Mommsen and Marquardt or Lange, wish nevertheless to possess themselves of the latest results of scholarship in this field. The rule of limitation which has guided the author in the composition of the entire work is well enough indicated in his words with regard to the chapter on *Rechtswesen*: "the questions which a man well informed in political matters, and not destitute of some knowledge of the principles of law, but who was neither a lawyer nor a judge, would raise, and what he would desire to know if he had to take a survey of the condition and practice of law in a foreign country, in which this entire side of public life rested upon a different basis from that of his own country; and at the same time the needs of philologists in the treatment of literature." The first chapter, upon the municipal and colonial administration of the Republic and the Empire, will be found especially instructive, as this is a field in which the author has distinguished himself as an original investigator and discoverer.

—Steinway Hall was again crowded on Thursday by the admirers of Mr. Joseffy and Mr. Thomas. The concert began with a fine performance of Beethoven's "Coriolan" overture, which Wagner, who has written an admirable analysis of it, justly pronounces one of his most important compositions—the musical accompaniment, as it were, of a pantomimic representation which is present to the mind's eye, the music embodying the whole poetic language of the situation. The other orchestral selections were Schubert's "Reiter-Marsch," with Liszt's orchestration, and that wondrous epitome of the greatest of all music-dramas—the introduction and finale of Wagner's "Tristan und Isolde," in the interpretation of which Mr. Thomas and his orchestra again proved their ability to guide the lava stream of ever-increasing passion to that violent overflow which seems to signify the annihilation of a universe. Mr. Joseffy's contributions were a number of short solo pieces, of which Schumann's "Vogel als Prophet" was

particularly well played, and two concertos: Chopin's First, in E minor, and one of his own, written in one movement. In the Chopin concerto the poetic significance of cantabile passages and sustained notes was not fully revealed, but the airy and graceful runs were executed with Mr. Joseffy's usual nimble and exquisite skill. Although Chopin, through want of practice, was not always at ease in his treatment of the orchestra, there are passages in the accompaniment to this concerto as remarkable for beauty of color as for originality of ideas. And it may be remarked here, in parenthesis, that Chopin's trio for piano, violin, and cello is beyond comparison the finest work of its kind ever written—a fact which utterly refutes the idea that Chopin could write only for the piano. Mr. Joseffy's own concerto, which has the merit of being short, will not secure him as prominent a place among composers as his execution of it assigns him among pianists. It is a work by a pianist for a pianist, and while it gives Mr. Joseffy ample opportunity to display his digital dexterity, it does not excite in the hearer any feeling beyond that of surprise. It is, however, ably scored, the treatment of the orchestra suggesting Liszt and Saint-Saëns, while the sudden introduction of cymbals and triangles in situations where they are not expected or called for is in accordance with the surprise method of Berlioz, which cannot be recommended for imitation, as the instrumentation ought to grow out of the idea, and not the idea out of the instrumentation. It need hardly be added that Mr. Joseffy's performance was, as usual, followed by demonstrative applause.

—The concert of the Symphony Society on Saturday evening was made memorable by the first appearance in this country of Mme. Albani since 1876. When it was known that, owing to her non-arrival on Friday, Miss Thursby had been engaged to take her place at the rehearsal, few probably expected to hear her at the concert. But she arrived on Friday evening, and courageously determined that the audience in the Academy should not be disappointed on the following evening. Quite at her best she could not show herself. In her first song she plainly betrayed the effects of the long sea voyage by singing a trifle below the pitch and with a want of mellowness and facility of execution. Bellini's "Casta Diva" was a poor selection to make for such an occasion, and it must be frankly stated that her singing of it was a decided disappointment. She was, however, repeatedly recalled, which showed that American audiences are not so cynical as they are sometimes said to be. In her second song—Haydn's "With Verdure Clad"—the defects just named almost entirely disappeared, showing her still possessed of that clear, rich, expressive voice which, coupled with her dramatic talent, has secured her so prominent a place among European *prime donne*. She is less at home among the floriture of Italian composers than in cantabile and dramatic passages and in the German Lieder, of which she sang a few specimens by Brahms and Rubinstein. Her long connection with the poor opera companies of London has had the bad result of making her strive for cheap effect by exaggerated shading or an over-prolonged note. In this respect she could learn a good lesson from Patti. Mme. Albani has been pronounced the finest *Elsa* on the stage by no less an authority than Dr. Hans von Bülow. The expectation of seeing her in that rôle next spring is, however, very much marred by the knowledge that she will be heard amid those wretched surroundings which Mr. Mapleson habitually provides for the delectation of his audiences. The orchestral parts of the programme embraced Beethoven's "Corio-

lan" overture, Schumann's Fourth Symphony, a march by Schubert, orchestrated by Liszt, and the Vorspiel to Wagner's "Meistersinger." Of these the march and overture were most satisfactorily performed. The symphony was, with the exception of the finale, played in a tame and uninteresting manner. It requires massive effects of sound which cannot well be given except with a larger orchestra. The "Meistersinger" prelude would have been more impressive had the trombones displayed a greater amount of courage and emphasis in the march passage. On the whole, however, the orchestra played better than ever before, and it is gratifying to see how much Dr. Damrosch has accomplished with it within a few months.

POOLE'S INDEX.

An Index to Periodical Literature. By Wm. F. Poole. Third edition, brought down to January, 1882, with the assistance, as Associate-Editor, of Wm. I. Fletcher, and the coöperation of the American Library Association and the Library Association of the United Kingdom. Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co. 1882. Large 8vo, xxvii. and 1,442 pp.

THE first edition of this work, a mere pigmy by the side of the present, was eagerly seized upon by college students when it appeared in 1848, and doubled the use of periodicals in university libraries; the second edition, published five years later, has refuted the often-repeated fallacy that a printed catalogue is of no use, because it must be incomplete the very day after its publication. Poole's 'Index' has been incomplete for thirty years, becoming every month more and more deficient in the most important matters, and yet it has been more used in all the libraries that owned it than any other book except "the dictionary" and perhaps "the gazetteer." All subjects are treated now in periodicals, often by the best writers. No one can treat exhaustively of any topic without knowing what the periodicals have said or are saying about it. For a generation no bibliography has been thought complete which did not enumerate articles in periodicals as well as books. Considering this, it is a wonder that we could have done so long without a continuation, as it is that the world could have got along without the telegraph and the telephone. To be sure, there were some substitutes—the indexes published by serial magazines, and latterly the Q. P. Indexes. But these, though more minute in their references, and therefore not superseded by the new work, are unhandy for ordinary use.

It may be doubted, however, whether student would have had this new time-saver, much as it was needed, without the aid of coöperation. To make the index of 1853 was no slight task; to have made it and never to have had any pay for it was not an encouragement to work on a new edition, and the longer it was delayed the more formidable did the work become, both for indexer and publisher. With the aid of fifty-one associates, it was not indeed easy, but possible. It is to be hoped that it will be also profitable, because public utility demands that it should be continued. The entries are already a year behind time; but it is the intention of the editors to issue an index for 1882 early in the spring; to follow this, if encouraged, with annual supplements, which will be consolidated, we suppose, every five or ten years, just as in Germany the classified lists of new publications, first issued every week, are combined quarterly, still in classified form, but with alphabetical indexes, and are again issued every three or four years in a single alphabet. If this is done, and if the projected index of essays not periodical is issued, the American schoolboy and school-

girl will live in a paradise of ease, so far as theme-writing is concerned. More advanced readers and writers will find it not perhaps of so constant, but of greater, benefit, even when the libraries to which they have immediate access do not possess the volumes referred to. So many libraries nowadays allow their volumes to circulate beyond the limits of the cities where they are, that a country minister, doctor, lawyer, literary man can generally get any volume of which he has need. It is for his advantage, then, that his town library should contain the work which tells him where he can find articles that treat of the subject of his investigations. In the same way, the great catalogue of the Library of the Surgeon-General's Office at Washington is useful all over the country.

The plan of the new edition is substantially the same as that of the old. As the greater mass of material required, there are more cross-references, though perhaps not yet enough. The comfort of cross-references—guide-boards that set a man right when he has been upon the wrong path—is seldom sufficiently appreciated by indexers. A man must himself have been lost to appreciate them. They are also useful when they point out to the man who is right as far as he has gone, that other paths which of himself he would hardly have thought of entering upon will give him additional views of his subject. A new feature is a chronological conspectus of the magazines indexed, in which the volumes are numbered continuously from the first to the last, with an entire and justifiable disregard of the numerous "series" in which some of the periodicals have indulged, with no other results (whatever the intention may have been) than to exhibit their editors' inability to count correctly, and to perplex the unfortunate persons who had to consult or catalogue them. In this table the first volume published in each year is given, so that it will be easy for owners of periodicals to remember them in accordance with the list, which was followed throughout in making the references in the body of the 'Index.'

The abbreviations are easily understood. In the titles of articles the general effect would have been clearer, we think, if the editors had adopted the modern custom of using capitals for nothing but proper names and the first words of titles. The increased length of some articles has necessitated more careful subdivision than was required in the previous edition. References under such headings as England, France, Great Britain, United States, are thrown into groups, and these groups are in certain cases arranged chronologically, as is done in the best catalogues. For instance, under Great Britain, which fills seventeen columns, the political articles, which alone make four columns, are brought together; a few general articles lead off, and then follow "in 1806," "in 1807." When we come to 1830-34, the Reform period, the references are, of course, numerous. In the same way, England (thirteen columns) has a group "Antiquities," and another "History," five columns long, and chronologically sub-arranged.

We have said that the work might never have been issued without coöperation; but there are some disadvantages in the coöperative method. Even when indexing is done by one person, or when several work in the same place, consulting one another, or under the orders of a single head, there will be occasional inconsistencies, however careful all concerned may be; but when fifty persons are indexing at as many different places, unable to refer each difficulty as it arises to the editor, and perhaps not always with sufficient experience to know that there is a difficulty, they are sure to treat the same cases in very different ways, and the number of

incongruities in the first draft must be many times greater; the editors would need a superhuman acuteness to detect them all. There is one pitfall to which the assistants are sure to lead their chief, and which he needs the most unsleeping vigilance always to avoid. When any subject or person has two names, one contributor may enter an article about it under the first, and another enter another article under the second. Unless the editor, when he comes to one entry, remembers the other, and so gets the two together, we shall find, to take an example from the book before us, entries both under Napoleon II. and Reichstadt, Duke of, and no cross-reference; and the reader who looks in either place will get only part of the literature of his subject. The only way to escape such misfortunes is for the editor to ask himself under every heading (there are at least 50,000 in the 'Index'). Is there any other word under which this subject can be spoken of? Was this person ever known by any other name or nickname? If he omits to do this, or if he does not know all the synonyms, or if he for the moment forgets one of them, he is lost; he may admit a serious error. His attention must not be relaxed for an instant; he must never be forgetful or confused or obtuse, however tired or hurried he may be. It is no disgrace to the present editors if, after rectifying scores of cases of double entry, a few yet remain. We find, for example, an article mentioned under Christina Leonora of Denmark, and two others under Leonora Christina, and no cross-reference either way; there are entries both under Decretals and False Decretals; under Duff, M. E. Grant, and Grant Duff; under De Maistre and Maistre, de; under d'Eon, Chevalier, and Eon de Beaumont, Chevalier d'; under Catalogues and Libraries, Catalogues of; under Classification and Libraries, Classification of; under Cataloguing and Libraries, Classification of Dictionary Catalogues; under College Libraries, and Libraries, College; under Kalb and De Kalb; under Algiers and Barbary States, and no cross-references in any case. Nor is there any reference from Du Defland (where French students would look for her) to Defland, Mme. du, which is the heading chosen. Most of the references to the Pretender are put under Charles Edward; but there is one under Stuart, Charles Edward, and unluckily, in the latter place, by one of those accidents which will happen in the best regulated printing-offices, the heading Stuart, Gilbert, has been transposed, so that all his references are given to Stuart, Charles Edward.

There is another class of errors for which the editors are hardly responsible—viz., those which arise from the frequent practice among magazine writers of selecting fanciful, and therefore obscure or misleading titles, for their articles. The indexer does not notice that a real person is concealed under a metaphorical or allusive appellation; and the editor, not having the magazine in his hands, has no means of detecting the oversight. We have no doubt that in many cases instinct has suggested that something was wrong, and investigation has disclosed the truth; but not always. Nobody noticed, for instance, that "Who Invented the Sewing-Machine?" (*Galaxy*, 4: 471) is really a sketch of Walter Hunt, and so the man who is looking for something about him will hunt in vain: some one did not discover that by "A Cagliostro of the Second Century" Froude (in the *Nineteenth Century*) meant Abonoteichos, and he—or she—puts it under Cagliostro. So an article in the *Atlantic* on the Gaucho is not put under its real subject, Quiroga; nor Bayard Taylor's "Land of Paoli" (*Atlantic*) under Corsica. An article on Calvin and Servetus in

Scribner's appears under neither C nor S, but under Geneva, because its author called it "Use of Fagots at Geneva"; an article in the *Atlantic* on James Fazy, called "Story of a Swiss Ring Politician," is neither under Fazy nor Switzerland nor Geneva; another in the same magazine, by Bayard Taylor, called "The Republic of the Pyrenees," is neither under Andorra nor Pyrenees nor Republic; one by Howells on Parini, "An Obsolete Fine Gentleman," is not indexed at all. "A Curiosity of Literature" (*Atlantic*) is not under Arnim, Bettina von, nor under Bettina; indeed, we have not found it anywhere. "El Llanero" (*Atlantic*) is not under Paéz. "The Jackdaw Author" (*St. Paul's and Liv. Age*) does not appear under St. Simon; "The First of the Stuarts" (*Quarterly and Liv. Age*) is not to be found under James I.; "The Chevalier's Conversion" (*St. Paul's and Liv. Age*) is not indexed at all.

A few articles appear to have been overlooked, or else the slips written were lost. There should be, but there are not, entries under Ablefeldt, Countess (*Liv. Age*, v. 62), Bibracte (by Hamerton, *Atlantic*, v. 26), Eishausen mystery (*Liv. Age*, v. 60), Fellenberg, E. von (*Atlantic*, v. 31), Samoan Islands (*Atlantic*, v. 22). The only misprint of a proper name that we have noticed is Bokhum, H., for Bokum. We will only add that the series of articles by Gladstone on Achilles' shield in the *Contemporary*, mentioned as reprinted in the *Canadian Monthly*, was also reprinted in the *Living Age*. These are slight blemishes in a great and useful work. No intimation is given in the preface that corrections are desired, but we have no doubt that all sent to the editors will be gratefully received, and used either for the correction of the stereotype plates, or, where this is impossible, will be inserted in the next supplement published. In this way coöperation will perfect its work.

THE WINTHROP PAPERS.

Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Vol. viii. Fifth Series. Boston: Published by the Society. 1882.

THE term "Winthrop Papers" applies to a mass of manuscripts collected or preserved by six generations of the Winthrop family in Connecticut, and which, in 1860, came into the possession of Mr. Robert C. Winthrop, President of the Massachusetts Historical Society. The new volume of the Collections is in reality the fourth volume of the Winthrop Papers, and is mainly made up of such letters of the sons and grandsons of the first Governor, John Winthrop, as have not hitherto appeared in print. The editors, Messrs. Charles C. Smith, George Dexter, and Robert C. Winthrop, jr., have furnished the necessary biographical and explanatory notes, and the last-named has borne the expense of printing the work. A portrait of John Winthrop, jr., forms the frontispiece.

It is appositely remarked by the editors, in their preface to the letters, that the writers "may be seen to have been amiable and genial men, good sons, affectionate husbands, devoted fathers and brothers, serviceable friends, not slothful in business, serving the Lord, given to hospitality, addicted to moderate amusement and scientific investigation, while perhaps singularly free from harshness and illiberality of word or deed"; and that their letters to each other were "helpful, straightforward, rarely digressing from the matter in hand, breathing a profound reliance on the will of God, and a spirit of devout resignation in sorrow and adversity." We are not inclined to say that the letters may be considered dull reading. They will come before only a small minority of the reading public, but that small minority will not fail to find in them

an abundance of interesting matter. Four John Winthrops appear in the pages of this volume—namely, John Winthrop, the first Governor of Massachusetts; his son, John Winthrop, jr.; his grandson of the same name, known as Fitz-John, to distinguish him from his father and grandfather; and his great-grandson, styled by his descendants "John Winthrop, F.R.S.," although John, jr., and Fitz-John were equally entitled to add to their names these honorable initials. Later on there was another John Winthrop, F.R.S., one of Harvard's most illustrious professors, but he comes not within the scope of this work. It is doubtful if any other American family can present so many bright examples of what has been called "inherited ability."

The letters of John Winthrop, jr., take up nearly a third of the book. As many as twenty-two had already been printed in the 'Life and Letters of John Winthrop,' and a considerable number of others are to be found in previous volumes of the Collections and Proceedings of the Historical Society. This man was one of the most eminent of New England's worthies. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and in 1631 followed his father to New England, where he became the founder of Ipswich, in Massachusetts, and New London, in Connecticut, and Governor of Connecticut from 1657 to his death in 1676. He practised the healing art extensively and gratuitously, and it is to be found in the 'Magnalia' that he was "furnished with noble medicines, which he most generously and charitably gave away upon all occasions, inasmuch that wherever he came, still the diseased flocked about him, as if the healing angel of Bethesda had appeared in the place." It is mentioned that in 1640 he was possessed of a library of more than a thousand volumes. He was the friend and correspondent of many learned men, and his letters dealing with various subjects—philosophy, chemistry, agriculture, astronomy, politics, literature, etc.—are proofs that he was one of the most accomplished scholars of the age.

Letters from other sons of the elder Winthrop—from Henry, who was accidentally drowned July 2, 1630, the day following his arrival in the country; Forth, a graduate of Cambridge University, who also met his death in 1630; Stephen, who came with his father to New England, was Recorder of Boston and a representative, and, returning to England, became a member of one of Cromwell's Parliaments and a colonel in his army; Adam, Deane, and Samuel—occupy about ninety pages of the work. Samuel Winthrop, the youngest of the first Governor's sons who lived to grow up to manhood, was for some time a student at Harvard, although not long enough to take a degree. At the age of eighteen he left the country to seek his fortune abroad, and eventually established himself as a planter in the Antilles. His letters—five to his father and sixteen to his brother John—form an interesting portion of the group, and were written from Teneriffe, Barbadoes, St. Christopher, Fayal, Rotterdam (where he married a Dutch lady), and Antigua. They show us something of his struggles with adversity, and are filled with sentiments of the truest piety. He was a Quaker, and in an account of the sufferings of that sect in Antigua is mentioned as one of four who refused to take the oath of allegiance at the time of the conquest of the island by the French in 1696. The Governor (Clodare) had summoned the English inhabitants together and told them they were all prisoners of war and at his mercy; that all who would take an oath of allegiance to the King of France might remain and enjoy their estates, but such as refused he would carry away, prisoners of war, to France. The inhabitants generally submitted and took the oath—all but the four Quakers, and they boldly refused, "for that they

could not swear, what suffering soever might follow." They would "freely promise not to fight against the King of France, nor for him, nor, indeed, against the King of England, nor for him," for, they said, "we can act no more for the one than the other in matter of war." Their firmness so impressed the Governor that he complimented them for their honesty, said that he was satisfied with their promise, and gave them their liberty. In the account from which we quote, Winthrop heads the list of sturdy Quakers, and appears to have been the spokesman. In 1671 he writes to his brother John:

"I have been much comforted to hear and read of thy tenderness to persecuted Friends in New England, who have taken up the cross and despised the shame, to give their testimony of the light and to reprove that which is evil, to declare against all buildings that are not set upon the rock, and have lost their lives for the testimony of Jesus."

It is recorded in 'New England Judged' that John Winthrop, jr., had labored with the Boston magistrates that they would not put the condemned Quakers to death, saying that he "would beg it of them on his bare knees that they would not do it." In 1672 Samuel recommends to the attentions of his brother "my friend Lewis Morris, who is among men known by the name of Col. Lewis Morris. By his brother Richard he made a considerable settlement at New York, whither he is going shortly (having received news of the death of his brother and his brother's wife) to look after his concerns there. I suppose thou mayest have heard of him (being a person very eminent), though not of his friendship towards me, which he hath in my lowest condition frankly continued, and still doth." Another of Winthrop's friends was George Fox, and the two had a "refreshing season" together in Barbadoes. In a letter to his brother (April 23, 1672), Samuel Winthrop gives a pathetic account of his endeavors to pay an obligation to William Bond, at Boston:

"When Ephraim Child desired me to pay that sixty-four pounds for him, I shipped in Saunders a great quantity of sugar, besides ten tons of lignum vite, then a very good commodity, but in both much more than would pay that sum. The said Saunders, as is supposed, foundered in the sea, being to this day unheard of, for aught I know. The second attempt I made in Captain Brookes, loading in his ship a parcel of choice sugar, which fell into De Ruyter's hands and was carried for Holland. A third time I sent sugar from hence to Nevis, to take freight for London."

Against this third shipment he drew bills of exchange in favor of William Bond, but the vessel carrying the bills, "after many weeks beating at sea, returned hither again and brought back said bills." A "fourth assay" to make the payment succeeded no better than the other three, and "once more" he makes a shipment of sugar and molasses, hoping thereby to "end this business." He continues: "Once William Bond wrote to me as if he thought I had forgotten, and sent me an abstract of my several letters to freshen my memory. Truly, brother, it hath proved a debt more dear to me than that I can so easily forget it." In a note introductory to his letters, it is stated that in 1688 he was Deputy Governor of Antigua. In other accounts he is named as the Governor, and it is certain that he was held in high esteem throughout the island. Among his descendants in the female line is Lord Lyons, long British Minister at Washington.

"It is the fate of man," says Cotton Mather, in his sermon at the funeral of Fitz-John Winthrop, "to be soon forgotten; he appears a very little while, and it is quickly forgotten that he was ever in the world." And then, a little further on, as if desiring to qualify the rule, he declares: "I say of this our Winthrop, he will be ever mentioned for his paternal, and patient, and generous administration of the public affairs."

A charge laid upon Fitz-John by his father, that if ever he had an opportunity to do any service for his country, he should do it with the greatest alacrity, he most faithfully fulfilled. He was for eight years the Governor of Connecticut, and for five years the colony's agent in England; he was a major in King Philip's war, and major-general and second in command of the expedition against Canada in 1690. When a young man he went to England, and served in the Parliamentary army with the rank of captain. He died in Boston, November 27, 1707, and was "buried with his fathers" in King's Chapel burying-ground. In view of three John Winthrops "together entombed in the same sleeping-place and sepulchre," his eulogist exclaims: "There is not such another Tomb to be seen in all America. One of the Seven Wonders of the World was a Tomb. This may be esteemed One of the American World." Most of Fitz-John Winthrop's printed letters are from rough drafts, or from copies kept by the writer. Presumably, many of his letters have been lost, for there are lapses of years in the correspondence—years very eventful in the history of the colonies. Those preserved run through a period of forty years—from 1660 to 1700.

Wait Still Winthrop (always mentioned as Wait Winthrop), younger brother of Fitz-John Winthrop, filled high stations in Massachusetts. He was Judge of the Court of Admiralty, Chief Justice of the Superior Court, Major-General of the Colonial Militia, member of the Executive Council, and acted a prominent part in the overthrow of Andros. He was one of the judges of the court which tried the Salem witches, and is reported to have been inclined to mercy, but none of his letters written in the year of those trials have been preserved. He died November 7, 1717, and had a funeral which, according to Sewell, cost the State £1,000, owing to the great parade of troops. This volume contains his letters from 1659 to 1699, the most of them being to his brother and largely taken up with family and business affairs. Writing to Sir Henry Ashurst, under date of July 25, 1698, he says:

"The places I have sustained since I have been concerned in the Government have hitherto been very expensive to me; and, indeed, I know no place that will yield a suitable recompense for my attendance on it, unless (as has been done of late and is not yet wholly laid aside) I shall eat up the poor as bread and squeeze them to death by virtue of an office; which is so contrary to my nature and inclinations that I had rather make one of them than mend my condition in that way. . . . I have not spent less than three thousand pounds while I have been concerned here, which I might have saved and added more than so much to it if I had neglected the public, and minded my private occasions; but if I have been any ways instrumental to serve the best interest here and keep this people from that slavery which they were groaning under and have almost forgot already, I am satisfied."

Massachusetts never had a more capable and faithful servant than Wait Winthrop.

John Winthrop, F.R.S., son of Wait Winthrop, graduated at Harvard in 1700. Only one of his letters is here given; but others from his hand, with those of Fitz-John and Wait Winthrop of a date later than 1700, will be printed in a forthcoming volume.

FRANCIS LIEBER.

The Life and Letters of Francis Lieber. Edited by Thomas Sergeant Perry. With portrait. Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co. 1882.

MR. PERRY has had no lack of materials for producing a biography of Dr. Lieber. He was probably, in fact, embarrassed by their abundance, as Dr. Lieber left behind him not only a large amount of legal, social, and political discussion, through which his mental life can be

traced, but also a correspondence which gives us very fully his personal history. Mr. Perry, with true biographical tact, very wisely decided to keep law and politics at a distance whenever this was possible. He has not himself attempted to produce an original work, but allows the reader to make the acquaintance of Lieber through his letters, which show him as he appeared to his contemporaries, full of enthusiasm, intelligence, and generous impulse. He was really rather a practical reformer than a theorist. He can hardly be said to have had an original or even a consistent system. Those who have gone over his works since his death have not found in them any distinctly new contribution to human thought. His celebrated legal maxim, "No right without its duty; no duty without its right," is not now regarded as expressing what he might have called an actual juristic fact, and the idea of the universal correlation of right and duty was not wholly new. Probably as time goes on it will turn out that, as a speculative writer, Lieber derived a large part of his reputation from the fact that the country possessed few speculative writers in his day, and was eager to magnify the importance of any "thinker" who made his home here. He was a recognized "thinker" among a people condemned for the most part to practical toil, but having a profound respect for thought, and a patriotic pride in any one, native or foreign-born, who increased the credit of the United States as a thinking country.

But when we come to see his character, as Mr. Perry successfully displays it in this volume, we perceive at once how it was that Lieber, as a man, produced a profound impression on his contemporaries. It is the fashion nowadays to associate enthusiasm with a lack of intellect. At the present day we are inclined to avoid, rather than to seek, the society of those who glow with feeling, and are fond of producing lofty and inspiring views of life, of human nature and the future of the race; not infrequently we are inclined to suspect them of having some personal end to gain.

When Lieber was a young man, it was not so. The air was full of enthusiasm, and the strongest and best men of the time were those who got most benefit from its bracing effect. We see it in careers of the most opposite type. Byron and Lieber, for instance, were both Philhellenes, and both went to Greece to fight for liberty. There was a firm conviction in the minds of both that the cause of most of the evils of the world was tyranny—the misgovernment and oppression of privileged classes; that human beings, if left to themselves, must act for the best, and that as soon as the shackles were knocked off, they would do so. With the modern conception of government as being a product of the civilization in which it arises, and therefore not to be regarded entirely as something imposed upon the community, the world in general was unfamiliar. This fact accounts for the mistakes, as it does for the triumphs, of the enthusiasts of the first quarter of the century. They looked upon the rising of the Greeks as they would have done upon the rising of the Germans or Italians, and overlooked altogether the vices of the Greek character which made successful self government so difficult for them. It was one of the first fruits of Lieber's campaign in Greece that he discovered that the value of liberty depends upon the use to which its possessors are capable of putting it.

We can trace through his letters the effect of experience in tempering without chilling the natural enthusiasm of his youth. He had by no means an easy or pleasant life, although he gained troops of friends and was crowded with honors at the last. When he came over here he

had a long and tedious struggle with poverty and adversity before he obtained any recognition of his merits. He had to teach swimming to boys. He had to provide articles covering the whole field of human knowledge for an encyclopædia. He had to exile himself in a Southern State, where he was obliged to keep his counsel as to the state of society in which he found himself, and at the same time to endure for his silence the risk of being considered among his friends at the North a renegade to his principles. It was not until he was a man of comparatively advanced years that he was able to secure that ease of mind and comfort without which successful intellectual labor is so difficult. In his old age he was afflicted by the division, caused by the war, in his family, one of his sons taking the Southern side. If through all his troubles he had preserved the illusions of his youth—the enthusiasm which sent the young "Colberger" to fight against Napoleon, and afterward to help the struggling Hellenes—we could hardly respect him as we do when we find that with advancing age he acquired a more and more practical turn, and saw the dangers of sweeping and sentimental views in politics. He saw in his time many sides of human life, and nothing that he saw soured his temper or diminished his desire to do what he could to serve his fellow man and his adopted country. His usefulness certainly will long be remembered in this community. It is evident from his letters that toward the close of his life (he had been so often applied to for advice and instruction) he got into the way of volunteering it somewhat unnecessarily on every variety of subject, and in all quarters—now making suggestions to a professor in Germany about an international code, and now advising Mr. Lincoln to withdraw his name from the field as a candidate for the Presidency. This habit grew upon him, and we cannot help being amused by it in his letters. But at the same time we have a feeling that, at its worst, his correspondents were amused, too, rather than offended. His goodness of heart is, in fact, always so apparent that the idea of offence is out of the question.

Diddle, Dumps, and Tot; or, Plantation Child Life. By Louise-Clarke Pymelle. Illustrated. Harper & Bros.

Uncle Gabe Tucker; or, Reflection, Song, and Sentiment in the Quarters. By J. A. Macon. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.

MRS. PYRNELLE'S little volume was advertised as a holiday book, but a book that is good for the holidays is good for all days, and, so far as the entertainment it will afford to children is concerned, the same may be said of the story of "Diddle, Dumps, and Tot." It also possesses interest for older folk as a faithful description of one phase of a system the literature of which is still comparatively meagre. In her preface, Mrs. Pymelle declares that she lays no claim to literary merit, and throughout the book there is a certain crudeness of style and various evidences of haste and awkwardness; but it sometimes happens that the literary art which is instinctive is as full of interest and information as that which is technical. Mrs. Pymelle's instinct has led her in the direction of simplicity, and the result is a book which is entertaining enough to be a great popular success.

Mr. Macon's book evidently has no purpose of any sort. It has no literary background or basis, no perspective, and no setting. It is unreasonably vague. Uncle Gabe Tucker, an alleged negro, is projected upon a typographical screen, and from this eminence—if it can be called such—he proceeds to give us brief essays on "Contentment," "Compensation," "Pa-

tience," "Culture," "Speculation," the arguments and the conclusions of which would do credit to a country lawyer. He sings us songs which, with one or two exceptions, are altogether lacking in the melodious inconsequence of genuine negro songs. One of the exceptions is called "Johnson Gals," and even this lacks the stalwart swing which a half-dozen verbal alterations would give it. It pleasantly suggests, however, an old Virginian negro song. After the songs, we have "aphorisms" and anecdotes, and in an appendix Mr. Macon has something to say of the negro dialect.

The moralizing of Uncle Gabe Tucker is shrewd, worldly-wise, sometimes witty, and nearly always ingenious; but it lacks humor—that peculiar humor which is the invariable result of a successful combination of the typical with the characteristic. We get Uncle Gabe's "views," but for all purposes of information they are worthless. Of Uncle Gabe, the man, the type, the character, there is not the slightest hint. Mr. Macon makes the common mistake of supposing that dialect is a mere matter of phonetics. A phonetical reproduction of pronunciation is a very simple affair. The blending of character with ideas, and the fitting of these to circumstances, are matters of both art and intuition. When Mrs. Pynelle puts into the mouth of an old negro woman the indignant exclamation, "Gwuf'm dar!" she paints, with one swift stroke, the character of the old Mammy that most Southern children have known. Mrs. Pynelle's phonetics, it should be said, are exceedingly awkward and inartistic, but, in spite of that, her dialect is almost perfect. A little while ago, a fugitive negro song went the rounds of the press. One line ran—

"Adam got stung wid a bummel-eye bee."

In "bummel-eye bee" not only have we negro character and idiom, but we know the very attitude and expression of the particular negro supposed to be singing.

Mr. Macon, in his essay on the negro dialect, in which he gives us opinions that are clearly not the result of any careful study or observation, declares that "although the negroes are dispersed over a broad area, their dialect is almost exactly the same throughout all the Southern States." We have seen it stated somewhere that Mr. Macon is a Mississippian. If he would take the trouble to step over into Louisiana, and ask a Creole negro for the story of how the terrapin outran the deer, the negro would begin (according to Dr. Mercier) something like this: "Dan tan lé zote foi, compair Chivreil avé compair Torti té tou lé dé apé té lamou à Mamzel Calinda," and so on. Then, should Mr. Macon visit the seacoast of South Carolina and Georgia, and ask for the same story, the negro would begin thus: "Oona yerry 'bout da tam w'in B'er Deer un B'er Cooter is bin lub da sem noung leddy?"—an interrogation that would probably strike Mr. Macon dumb.

It remains to be said here that in Mrs. Pynelle's volume are to be found two or three thoroughly characteristic negro songs, the most noteworthy being a spirited version of that remarkable "spiritual," "Roll dat Jordan, Roll!" the music of which is given in "Slave Songs of the United States."

Dr. Grimshawe's Secret: a Romance. By Nathaniel Hawthorne. Edited, with Preface and Notes, by Julian Hawthorne. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1883.

THE appearance of any new work of Hawthorne's is an important literary event; and an unfinished novel by him possesses almost as much interest as a finished one. When his note-books were published, some years ago, they were at once welcomed as a significant addi-

tion to our knowledge of him, both as a man and as an author. Whether such an addition ought or ought not to have been made is, as a mere literary question, of comparatively little consequence. Having been published, the note-books gave us so much more of Hawthorne than we had before; and, however doubtful we might be of the wisdom of the publication, we could not possibly shut our eyes to the light which it threw upon his life and labors. In the same way, we should be inclined, under ordinary circumstances, to say that "Dr. Grimshawe's Secret," being actually given to the public, it is idle to waste time in discussing the question whether it had better have been given or not. It is published, and the question is, what we think of it. But the circumstances which have attended the appearance of this novel are somewhat exceptional, and it differs from Hawthorne's previous posthumous works in having encountered at the outset a doubt as to its authenticity.

On what this doubt originally rested, it is hard to say. Mr. Keningale Cook has recently published a letter saying that he saw the manuscript of the story four years ago. It was lent him by Mr. Julian Hawthorne, who said he had copied it from his father's original manuscript, with much difficulty and labor, owing to the faintness of the ink and the character of the handwriting. He admitted, however, to Mr. Cook that he had not copied the whole, and that the original had been mislaid. Mr. Cook adds the following (we quote from his communication in the London *Athenæum*):

"If the children of letters were as wise in their generation as the children of science, certain expressions of doubt as to the true authorship of 'Dr. Grimshawe' would surely have been delayed until the appearance of the work. Prof. Owen, with two small bones before him, could specify the animals to which they belonged, and with two whole books side by side, the one by the elder, the other by the younger Hawthorne, any literary analyst could surely tell to which they appertained without looking at the title-page."

Mr. Julian Hawthorne has an exceedingly robust style of his own, and the difference of his manner and method from that of his father has become more and more marked since the opening chapters were written of 'Bressant,' his first published work of fiction. In a single sentence the very rhythm will usually enable us to decide whether it is the father's work or the son's. The delicious dawdlings of Nathaniel Hawthorne; the agreeable digressions into byways of fancy into which he beguiles himself, and at the same time charms his reader into wandering—these and other quaint and rare characteristics form the bouquet of the wine of the older vintage; and no strength of the newer wine, however deftly blended, could be mistaken for the other, except by the dullest and furriest of literary palates."

A great deal of this would be very true in the case of an attempt at a Hawthorne forgery. If Mr. Julian Hawthorne were supposed capable of such an unnatural crime, it would no doubt be discovered, because the finished style of the author of 'The Scarlet Letter' is as individual as that of any writer who has ever used the language, and differs from that of his son in one respect which the latter would never be able to mask—we mean the exquisite taste and delicate, evanescent humor that pervades it. But if he had left preparatory studies for a story, and these had been pieced together by his son, it would seem to us to be out of the question to tell from internal evidence what part of the work had been done by the author and what by the editor.

Now, Mr. Hawthorne admits that he has "edited" the story to a certain extent in this way. The manuscript, he says, "presents various apparent inconsistencies"; and "in transcribing the work for the press, these inconsistent sentences and passages have been withdrawn

from the text and inserted in the appendix, or, in a few unimportant instances, omitted altogether." But if we are to judge by the long passages from manuscript recently printed in the *Century*, Mr. Hawthorne is mistaken in calling these omissions "few" and "unimportant"; and in any case, to allow him to judge what is important, and what is unimportant, is a right that we can hardly concede to the editor of what he calls a "complete" story by Nathaniel Hawthorne. Mr. Julian Hawthorne also admits in his preface that "in the manuscript each person figures in the course of the narrative under from three to six different names," and that this difficulty has been met by bestowing on each of the characters "the name which last identified him to the author's mind." We must say that all this looks as if "complete" were a rather strong word to apply to the story as it originally stood.

Under these circumstances, whatever we may think of the doubts expressed before the volume appeared, we cannot but feel that Mr. Hawthorne's preface hardly tends to set them altogether at rest. The only way to have avoided this would have been to publish the manuscript, and the whole of it, exactly as it was left by his father. As to the story itself, while it abounds in passages marked by all the beauties of Hawthorne's best writing, it is as a whole crude and raw. That he would have published it as it stands, or even nearly as it stands, is inconceivable, and, therefore, it seems a waste of time to discuss the plot as such. In fact, the lover of Hawthorne will be glad to find in the fact that the book required "editing" a justification for declining to become interested in it, at least until he knows more precisely what the limits of the editor's labors were.

The Land and the Book; or, Biblical Illustrations drawn from the Manners and Customs, the Scenes and Scenery, of the Holy Land, Central Palestine and Phœnicia. By William M. Thomson, D.D., forty-five years a Missionary in Syria and Palestine. 130 illustrations and maps. Harper & Bros. 1882.

THIS new volume of 'The Land and the Book,' of which 'Central Palestine and Phœnicia' is, in fact, the principal title, forms an independent work, though completing by its contents the first two volumes, published twenty-three years ago, which treated of Southern Palestine. Like its predecessors, it will readily become a favorite household book among that class of the public for which it is written—the devout believers in the word of the Scriptures. Those who regard Palestine as "the divinely prepared tablet whereon God's messages to men have been graven in ever-living characters," must find a rich source of enjoyment, knowledge, and edification in such pen-pictures as are here presented. The author has seen so much of "the Land," has so minutely examined every point that can afford illustration for "the Book," and describes what he has seen so accurately and so vividly, that even the less devout reader who is tempted to reproach him with a lack of critical sense, with a proneness to discover too many traces of Biblical antiquity, and too many analogies between the hoary past and the present, cannot fail to draw abundant information from his pages, or to admire the charming naturalness of many of his off-hand sketches. The style is excellent throughout, and plain with very rare exceptions, when it assumes a pleasant tinge of poetry, as in the following:

"The young Jordan! type of this strange life of ours! Bright and beautiful in its cradle, laughing its very morning away through the flowery fields of the Hûleh; plunging with the recklessness of youth into the tangled brakes

and muddy marshes of Merom; hurrying thence, full-grown, like earnest manhood, with its noisy and bustling activities, it subsides into life's sober midday in the placid Lake of Gennesaret. When it goes forth again, it is down the inevitable declivity of old age, sinking deeper and deeper, in spite of doublings and windings innumerable, until it disappears for ever in that Sea of Death, that melancholy bourne from which there is neither escape nor return. . . . Must this type of life and immortality be swallowed up by the Dead Sea? Far from it. That is but the Jordan's highway to heaven. Purified from every gross and earthly alloy, it is called back to the skies by the all-attracting sun. . . .

This ascension of the Jordan, by a process of evaporation, is to remind the reader of "that other resurrection, when Christ shall come in the clouds, and all the holy angels with him." "Nor is this the only lesson which this river has to teach the willing student of the Holy Writ." A brief statement, in Bible words, of the crossing of the stream under the lead of Joshua, serves to teach him the lesson of "all-conquering faith," such as "carried ten thousand times ten thousand of God's people in triumph through the Jordan of death to the Canaan of eternal rest." And this is followed by another glance at the Jordan's birthplace, the pool, or fountain, crowded with odd-looking buffaloes, with nothing but their noses above water. "Observe that their mouths are all turned up stream toward the fountain, and on a level with the surface, as if, like Job's behemoth, they trust that they could drink up a river, and can draw up Jordan into their mouths. . . . These black, hairless brutes are the modern representatives of that 'chief of the ways of God,' who 'eateth grass as an ox,' who 'lieth under the shady trees, in the covert of the reed and fens. The shady trees cover him with their shadow, the willows of the brook compass him about.'" Just so, under the covert of the reeds and willows of brooks creeping through the marsh of the Hüleh, do the buffaloes lie, wallowing in the mire. Our author carries out his retrospects and comparisons in an easy-going way, without regard to the facts that the Hebrews did not cross the Jordan under Joshua near its fountain-head, but near its mouth; that they found no rest in Canaan, but almost eternal strife and trouble; and that the behemoth of Job is, by the best expounders, identified, not with the buffalo, but with the hippopotamus. We find him also little exact in the chronology of the district containing the head waters of the Jordan when he says that Benhadad took the town of Dan "nearly a thousand years before Christ," and "Tiglath Pileser . . . all this region some two hundred years later," for there were almost exactly three hundred years between the two conquests, according to the chronology of "the Book." Whether his general map—certainly much inferior in execution to the numerous pictorial illustrations, after photographs taken by himself, which add life to his descriptions—is not equally inaccurate in the placing and naming of the volcanic tells facing the upper Jordan on the east, we do not venture to assert; but it strongly conflicts with Kiepert's map of Galilee and adjoining parts in Socin's "Palästina und Syrien" (Baedeker's publication of 1880), now recognized as the standard authority on these countries.

Dr. Thomson's diligence in research and examination is evinced most strikingly in points in the life of Christ demanding illustration or justification. Let the reader peruse with attention, for instance, his dissertation showing how, at Capernaum, "the paralytic, borne by four of his friends to the top of the house, was 'let down' from the roof, 'with his couch, into the midst before Jesus,' . . . without damage to the house or its occupants," though the bearers

"are said not only to have 'uncovered the roof,' but 'they had broken it up.'" The houses of Capernaum, we are told, were, like those in modern villages of Galilee, "low, with flat roofs easily reached by a stairway from the yard or court. Jesus probably stood in the open lewân," or reception-room, "or he may have taken his stand in the covered court, in front of the house itself. . . . Those who carried the paralytic, not being able to 'come nigh unto him for the press,' ascended to the roof," which is only a few feet above the floor, and removed a part of it; "and by stooping down and holding the corners of the couch—merely a thickly padded quilt, like those used at present in this region—the sick man could have been let down without any ropes or cords." In the same way the people of the country are still wont to let down grain, straw, and other articles from the roofs of their houses. "The only difficulty in this explanation is to understand how they could break up the roof without sending down such a shower of dust as to incommode our Lord and those around him." This last difficulty is removed by a description of the materials now employed in the construction of roofs: "beams placed about three feet apart, across which short sticks are arranged close together, and covered with a thickly-matted thorn-bush called bellân. Over this is spread a coat of stiff mortar, and above that marl or earth. . . . They had merely to scrape back the earth from a portion of the roof over the lewân, or court, take up the thorns or short sticks, and let down the couch between the beams at the very feet of Jesus." This explanation, we have no doubt, will prove perfectly satisfactory to most readers of the book.

Recollections of Dante Gabriel Rossetti. By T. Hall Caine. Boston: Roberts Bros. 1882.

MR. CAINE is a young man who knew Rossetti during the last four years of his life, mainly through correspondence, but in the months preceding his death more intimately as his constant companion. The reminiscences cover a narrow portion of the poet's career, and reveal him, we have no doubt, in his least admirable character. At the time when Rossetti's attention was first called to Mr. Caine, by a commendatory criticism sent by the latter, he had lived for several years in seclusion, in a large and lonely house, whose solitude was brightened only by the visits of intimate friends who came to cheer and comfort him. He had already passed through one severe physical crisis, during which he seems to have been overcome by the illusion, induced by hostile criticism, that there was a banded conspiracy to put him down, and to this hallucination he was still subject. Mr. Caine writes: "Rossetti was one of the most magnetic of men, but it was not more his genius than his unhappiness that held certain of his friends as by a spell." It is this unhappiness rather than his genius that the "Recollections" set forth; they show us a broken man, a spirit in decline. It would be wrong, therefore, to accept the portrait as final, or as one really valuable. Furthermore, although the author's announced intention was to exhibit the poet's personality, his success in this regard is incomplete: he gives a very vivid account of Rossetti's surroundings and habits, interweaving with it remarks, criticism, and information, either his own or the poet's, which are valuable; but in the whole volume there is little to throw light on the relations between the poet's work and his personality. The reminiscences are largely of external things, and even in the letters there are remarkably few fine expressions of individuality; character is seldom clearly seen, and, we are sorry to add, when seen, is not noble.

To give at once an impression of the atmos-

phere that enveloped Rossetti, and overhangs this book as well, we will quote a few passages at length in description of the house in which he kept himself isolated:

"Rossetti's house had to me the appearance of a plain Queen Anne erection, much mutilated by the introduction of unsightly bay-windows; the brickwork seemed to be falling into decay; the paint to be in serious need of renewal; the windows to be dull with the accumulation of the dust of years; the sills to bear the suspicion of cobwebs; the angles of the steps and the untrod flags of the courtyard to be here and there overgrown with moss and weeds; and round the walls and up the reveals of doors and windows were creeping the tangled branches of the wildest ivy that ever grew untouched by shears."

With this exterior the poet's bedroom within harmonized as if in one of Poe's stories:

"The room was dark with heavy hangings around the walls as well as the bed, and thick velvet curtains before the windows, so that the candles in our hands seemed unable to light it, and our voices sounded thick and muffled. In the middle, before a little couch, stood a small table, on which was a wire lantern containing a candle, which Rossetti lit from the open one in his hand—another candle meantime lying by its side. I remarked that he probably burned a light all night. He said that was so. 'My curse,' he added, 'is insomnia. Two or three hours hence (it was already 4 A. M.) I shall get up and lie on the couch, and, to pass away a weary hour, read this book.' . . . It did not escape me that on the table stood two bottles, sealed and labelled, together with a little measuring glass. Without looking further at it, but with a terrible suspicion growing over me, I asked if that were his medicine. 'They say there is a skeleton in every cupboard,' he said in a low voice, 'and that's mine; it is chloral.'"

Mr. Caine's own apartment was even more heavy with gloom, and strewn with Oriental oddities, "left there, apparently, to scare the chambermaid," and threatening "to murder the innocent sleep." It is no wonder that when he left the door he felt that "outside the air breathed freely." From that time he was but little at the house until he came to make it his abode, when Rossetti, wholly subdued and physically broken by the chloral, was nearing his death.

The friendship was continued by letters, of which the topics are literary. They do not display any critical faculty on Rossetti's part, and Mr. Caine frankly acknowledges their weakness. They are about sonnets, ballads, prose style, and the more or less obscure poets whom the coterie has made familiar by name, such as Wells, Jones, and Brown, and also the great poets, Keats, Milton, Wordsworth, and Coleridge. In the estimate placed on these men there is nothing for which the reader is not prepared by the published works of Rossetti's group; but as instances of their essential prejudice or at least exaggeration, here is a passage on Chatterton: "He is as great as any English poet whatever, and might absolutely, had he lived, have proved the only man in England's theatre of imagination who could have banded parts with Shakspeare"; on Wordsworth, "Vital lyrical impulse was never fully developed in his muse." There are other judgments as one-sided, and none, we think, that are not wholly subjective. The value of the letters, considered from the literary point of view, lies simply in their expression of the poet's taste: as an expression of his nature, they had better have been left unpublished. It is enough to say that while the sight of a disciple burning incense and an idol dispensing grace is at least harmless, the anxiety of Rossetti for praise, his keen sensitiveness to the most indirect and contingent blame, are oppressive, and would lower one's estimate of his character were it not for the certainty that, in this intense form, they were due to his physical condition. In other respects, too, Mr. Caine has hardly been the judicious

friend. Devoted and tender as he shows himself to the poet, his worst fault can be called only an excessive frankness; but what need was there of his saying, "He was a man of so much impulse—impulse often as violent as lawless—that to oppose him merely provoked anger to no good purpose"; or, "Irresolution was indubitably his most noticeable quality at the time; . . . irresolution and melancholy lay at the basis of his nature"? This was the fact undoubtedly during these last exhausted years, but the account given by his lifelong friends is very different, and to perpetuate the memory of a man in his worst days is practical injustice.

There is a goodly amount of minute and curious information interspersed with these larger matters: the dates of the poems, the best of them being written before the poet was twenty-five; the details of the burial of his MS. book of sonnets ("The House of Life") in the coffin of his dead wife; the fact that "The Blessed Damozel" was suggested by Poe's "Raven," the one being the grief of the heavenly spirit, as the other was of the earthly lover; Rossetti's habit of composition—"I lie on the couch, the racked and tortured medium, never permitted an instant's surcease of agony until the thing on hand is finished"—and other like details. Among them is a story, interesting to Americans, with which we conclude this notice of an interesting, if somewhat morbid and indiscreet, book:

"Longfellow had called upon him while he was painting the 'Dante's Dream.' The old poet was courteous and complimentary to the last degree; he seemed, however, to know little or nothing about painting as an art, and also to have fallen into the error of thinking that Rossetti, the painter, and Rossetti, the poet, were different men—in short, that the Dante of that name was the painter, and the William the poet. Upon leaving the house Longfellow had said: 'I have been glad to meet you, and should like to have met your brother; pray tell him how much I admire his beautiful poem, 'The Blessed Damozel.' Rossetti answered, 'I will tell him.'"

Edward III. By Rev. W. Warburton, M. A. [Epochs of Modern History.] With three maps. Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. 233.

MR. WARBURTON'S 'Edward III.' covers one of the most important and most familiar periods of the Middle Ages. It has the merits of all the series to which it belongs, and is among the best as regards vividness of narration, while in certain points of detail there is some inaccuracy. It is hardly correct (p. 46) to speak of the Court of Champagne as one of the great feudatories who rendered to the King hardly more than a nominal allegiance; for Champagne was at this time, to all intents and purposes, under the direct authority of the King, although it was not formally annexed to the crown until 1361. Nor is it correct to

say (p. 158) that Edward III. claimed the crown of France "as eldest grandson of Philip IV.," but rather (as is stated on p. 36) as "nearest male in blood to the deceased sovereign." Charles IV. From this it follows that his title, whatever its value, was not affected by the birth, in 1332, of Charles the Bad; for Edward was nephew of Charles IV., while Charles the Bad was only his great-nephew. Edward certainly had a better title than Charles the Bad, while the validity of his claim against Philip of Valois depended upon the Salic law alone. Now, here again Mr. Warburton is mistaken in the statement (p. 35) that in France "the succession had been from time immemorial regulated by the Salic law." There had been no opportunity for the application of that law for four hundred and fifty years, for which time—from Robert the Strong to Louis X.—the Capetian line had never suffered a break in the descent from father to son. This law was in point of fact first established by Philip V., in his own behalf, on the death of the infant John I.

The maps are good, as in all the books of this series, but in the map of Europe at the beginning of the book Sicily is so colored as to give the impression that it was united with Naples: at this period it was an independent kingdom.

Simplified Grammar of the Hungarian Language. By Ignatius Singer. London. 1882.

THIS little book forms a part of 'Trübner's Collection of Simplified Grammars of the Principal Asiatic and European Languages,' edited by the late lamented Prof. E. H. Palmer. It is the third Hungarian grammar published in English, the first two being Wékey's (London, 1852) and Csink's (London, 1853). The simplification is less noticeable in brevity and conciseness of style, and in the omission of rules needful only to writers in the language, than in the absence of translating exercises and the paucity of examples. It is not an easy task to study a new tongue, and especially one so totally different in its structure from all our Occidental idioms, with the aid of a condensed manual like this, but it offers an easy perspective to the curious dilettante in comparative linguistics. Mr. Singer has done his work with diligence and care, including the proof-reading, which in Magyar books, on account of the frequent and multifarious accents, is not an easy task. Slips occur, however, here and there. Thus we notice "leeset" for "leesett," and "háztol" for "háztól" (page 23); "húszadik" and "huszad" (p. 28); "húszanegy" and "huszonegy-szer" (p. 29); "réám," "réád," etc., for "redm," etc. (p. 38); and "mennyi, amennyi" for "mennyi, amennyi" (p. 44). The passive "változtatott" (p. 23) is, unfortunately for the honor of the rich Hungarian verb, still short of two t's; it ought to be *változtaltott*. In the main

verbal paradigm, "varni, to sow," both the Magyar and English are wrong throughout, "var" standing for *varr*, and "sow," "sowed," "sown," for *sew* and *sewed*.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

- Art, L'. Vol. xxxi. J. W. Bouton.
Bancroft, G. History of the United States. The author's last revision. Vol. I. D. Appleton & Co. \$2 50.
Bible Myths, and their Parallels in Other Religions. Numerous illustrations. J. W. Bouton.
Brace, C. L. Gesta Christi; or, A History of Humane Progress under Christianity. A. C. Armstrong & Son. \$2 50.
Cohn, M. M. An Essay on the Growth of Law. Chicago: Callaghan & Co.
Curtis, M. M. The Cause of Variation. Marshall, Minn.: M. M. Curtis.
Folger, Peter. Looking-Glass for the Times. [R. I. Historical Tracts, No. 16.] Providence: S. S. Rider.
Foster, R. The Taxation of the Elevated Railroads. G. F. Putnam's Sons. 25 cents.
Freeman, A. C. The American Decisions. Vol. xl. San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft & Co.
Friend, Rev. H. Glossary of Devonshire Plant Names. London: Trübner & Co.
Gerhard, W. P. House-Drainage and Sanitary Plumbing. D. Van Nostrand.
Goldammer, H. The Kindergarten. Berlin: Carl Habel.
Granite Monthly. Vol. v. Concord: John N. McClintock.
Graves, Rev. R. P. Life of Sir Wm. Rowan Hamilton. Vol. I. London: Longmans.
Haeckel, E. Indische Reisebriefe. Berlin: Gebr. Paetel.
Hall, T. B. Three Articles on Modern Spiritualism. Second series. Boston: A. Williams & Co.
Harris, J. Gardening for Young and Old. Orange Judd Co. \$1 25.
Hawthorne, N. Dr. Grinshaw's Secret. Edited, with Preface and Notes, by Julian Hawthorne. Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co. \$1 50.
Hazen, H. A. History of Billerica, Mass. Boston: A. Williams & Co.
Lanessan, J. L. de. La Botanique. Paris: C. Reinwald.
New York: F. W. Christern.
Lindsley, D. P. The Handbook of Takigrafiy. Designed for the use of Verbatim Reporters. D. P. Lindsley.
Lippincott's Magazine. New series, vol. iv., July-December, 1882. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.
Littell's Living Age. October-December, 1882. Boston: Littell & Co.
Lyons, J. A. Scholastic Annual for 1883. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame.
Neely, T. B. The Church Lyceum: its Organization and Management. Phillips & Hunt.
Pabor, W. E. Colorado as an Agricultural State. Orange Judd Co. \$1 50.
Rededication of the Old State-House. Boston.
Riddell, R. The Slide Rule Simplified, Explained, and Illustrated. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. \$3.
Rishell, D. Elfrida: a Drama. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. \$1.
Seth-Haldane. Essays in Philosophical Criticism. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
Spender, Mrs. John Kent. Gabrielle de Bourdain. Harper's Franklin Square Library. 20 cents.
Vannah, Kate. Verses. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. \$1.
Velch, J. Hamilton. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. \$1 25.
Vincent, J. H. The Sunday-School Normal Class. Phillips & Hunt.
Vincent, J. H. The Revival, and After the Revival. Phillips & Hunt.
Wharton, E. R. Etyma Græca: an Etymological Lexicon of Classical Greek. T. Whittaker.
Williams, G. F. Bullet and Shell: War as the Soldier Saw It. Illustrated. Fords, Howard & Hulbert. \$2 75.
Wolffberg, Dr. S. Dr. B. C. Faust's Laws of Health for the Use of Schools and Self-Instruction. Brooklyn: H. Kopp & Co.

WALKER'S Political Economy.

By Francis A. Walker, President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, late Superintendent of the Census. (Volume V. of The American Science Series.) 8vo, \$2 25.

President Walker's economical works on 'The Wages Question' and on 'Money,' not to speak of his great statistical Atlas of the United States, have given him a prominent position on both sides of the Atlantic. In contributing the present work to the "American Science Series," he brings to bear not only the powers shown in his former writings, but the experience of many years as teacher of political economy in the chair he occupied at Yale before accepting the presidency of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

HENRY HOLT & CO., New York.

THE CHICKERING PIANO

"THE BEST IN THE WORLD."

Before buying elsewhere, write for circular and price-list to

CHICKERING & SONS,

CHICKERING HALL, MANUFACTORY,
130 Fifth Avenue, N. Y. 150 Tremont St., Boston

UNMOUNTED PHOTOGRAPHS

OF ANCIENT and MODERN WORKS of ART, embracing reproductions of famous original paintings, sculpture, architecture, etc. Price, cabinet size, \$1 50 per doz. Send 6-cent stamp for catalogue and supplement of 3,700 subjects. SOULE PHOTOGRAPH CO., successors to John P. Soule, Publishers, 338 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

NORTH GERMAN LLOYD STEAMSHIP COMPANY, FOR SOUTHAMPTON AND BREMEN.

The steamers of this Company will sail every Saturday from Bremen Pier, foot of Third Street, Hoboken. RATES OF PASSAGE TO LONDON, HAVRE, AND BREMEN.

First Cabin, \$100; Second Cabin, \$60; Steerage, \$30; Prepaid Steerage Certificates, \$24.

For freight or passage apply to

OELRICHS & CO., AGENTS,
2 Bowling Green.

IN any family, whether large or small, but especially where the number of children is large, a record of the constitutional peculiarities of each one, and the whole course of its physical development in sickness and in health, is certain to be instructive and may prove invaluable. Such a record is Professor J. B. Fonssagrives's 'Mother's Register,' consisting of a series of tables scientifically arranged for brief and convenient entries. A separate volume for boys and for girls. Price, post-paid, 75 cents per volume, or \$1 25 for two volumes. Address Publisher of the Nation.

